

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1865.

---

ART. I.—*Méditations sur l'Essence de la Religion Chrétienne.*  
Par M. GUIZOT. Paris: Lévy Frères. 1864.

THIS is a remarkable book; and if its contents were less remarkable than they are, the name of its author would be a more than sufficient claim upon our attention. For M. Guizot, though a foreigner and a member of a foreign communion, is one of those men for whom an English Churchman cannot fail to feel a very deep sympathy and respect. England, and English institutions, and the English Church, have received at his hands a far larger amount of thoughtful study and intelligent appreciation than most Frenchmen have thought it worth their while to bestow upon us. His history of our Revolution of the seventeenth century shows a power of understanding the English character, and of grasping the real questions at issue in that long struggle, which is very seldom to be met with in a foreigner. He is fond of studying the life and times of any Englishman of eminence. He has written upon Shakespeare, upon William Pitt, upon Sir Robert Peel, upon the late Prince Consort, and shown in each case that his work was a labour of love. And in the book whose title we have placed at the head of the present article he quotes naturally and familiarly names which, whether for good or for evil, have become household words among ourselves—such names as those of David Hume, of Dr. Chalmers, of John Stuart Mill, of Arthur Stanley. In the natural disposition of his mind, as well as in the character of his intellect, he seems to be far nearer to ourselves than most of his countrymen.

But this, though it appeals to our national sympathy, is the smallest part of his claim to our attention. M. Guizot is the most conspicuous member of the French Protestant Communion, and the religious element in which he has lived has been one of most unusual trouble and difficulty. Few men have had a more difficult part to play, and very few have played their part better than he. The event of many a crisis has depended

upon the calmness of his judgment and the steadfastness of his will. More than once it has been his lot to preside amid the shock of opposite parties in the very heat and fury of their struggle; and he has stood unmoved between them, a partizan of neither and therefore misunderstood by both. A determined opponent of the wild rationalism which is struggling to gain the upper hand among the French Protestants, he at the same time is compelled to withhold his sympathy from the narrow dogmatism of the noisier members of the so-called orthodox party. The Protestants of France have great reason to be thankful that, in such times, such a man is at the helm. For though M. Guizot is a layman, yet his force of character, and his position as President of the Protestant Bible Society, give him a powerful voice in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs; and that voice is never raised to serve the purposes of a party, nor silenced by any considerations of selfish interest.

We may well listen to such a man as this, when he comes forward at the age of seventy-seven, and at the close of an eventful career, to tell us his '*Meditations upon the Essence of the Christian Religion.*' He has read much and thought deeply; but what he tells us in these '*Meditations*' is confessedly the result, not of reading, but of life, amid the conflicts of political factions, and the struggles of religious parties. He has been silently taking note of a Truth which underlies them all, and these '*Meditations*' are an effort to exhibit that Truth to the world. Painful experience has taught him to recognise the value of Christian faith and Christian liberty, and he is determined to consecrate the retirement of his old age to the promotion of their cause. That cause, he believes, must finally prevail, for he is convinced that it is the cause of God. Yet he deeply feels the magnitude of the crisis through which the Church and the world are at present passing; for though during nineteen centuries the Christian religion has been the object of attacks of greater violence, it has never had to sustain any of greater moment than those of the present day. For 'she is living now in the presence of 'liberty. She has to do with free thought, with free discussion. 'She is called upon to defend herself, to be her own watch and 'ward, to prove continually, and against all comers, her moral 'and historical truth, her claim upon the intellect and the soul 'of man.'

'Religious liberty, that is to say, the liberty to believe, to believe differently from others, or not to believe at all, is still imperfectly acknowledged and guaranteed in several States; but it is visibly becoming more and more the general fact, and it will henceforth be the common right throughout the civilised world. This fact is the more momentous because it does not stand alone. It forms but a part in the great intellectual and social revolution which, after several ages of ferment and preparation, has come to light and is accomplishing



itself in our own days. The scientific spirit, the preponderance of democracy, and political liberty, are the essential characters and the irresistible tendencies of this revolution. These new powers may fall into very great errors and make very great mistakes, for which they will always have to pay dearly; but they are definitively installed in modern society. The sciences will continue to develop themselves in full independence both of their methods and of their results; democracy will establish itself in the positions which it has conquered, and in the paths which are open to it; political liberty, in spite of its storms and its disappointments, will compel men more or less slowly to accept it as the necessary guarantee of every blessing which has been acquired, and of every advance which is yet possible in social order. These are now the dominant facts, to which all public institutions must adapt themselves, and with which every kind of moral authority must contrive to live in peace.

'The Christian religion is not exempt from this trial. It will surmount it as it has surmounted so many others. Its origin and essence would not be divine if it could not lend itself to the various forms of human society, and be now a guide, now a support, to men, in all their vicissitudes of good and evil. But it is of infinite importance that Christians should not mistake the nature of the battle which they have to fight, and of the arms which are at their command. The attack upon the Christian religion is eager; and it is pursued sometimes with a brutal fanaticism, sometimes with skill and cunning, and in the name sometimes of the worst passions, sometimes of sincere convictions. One contradicts it as false; another rejects it as too exacting and troublesome; the majority dread it as tyrannical.

'Christians, on the other hand, find a difficulty in accepting the new state of society, and in playing their part in it. They are every moment shocked, irritated, terrified, by the ideas and the language of the day. People cannot easily pass from privilege to equal rights, and from a dominant position to liberty. One cannot without an effort submit to bold and obstinate contradiction, to the necessity of daily resistance and daily victory.'

M. Guizot is most anxious that the Christian Church should cordially and freely accept the state of things which, whether she will or no, is existing around her; that she should adapt herself, as she has adapted herself a hundred times before, to the need of the generation which she has to influence; that she should not sit sullenly apart from the intellectual strife which is at present raging, but boldly descend into the arena, and prove her divine commission; that she should distinctly perceive that she has to encounter a new enemy, to satisfy a new want, that the weapons which have been so often changed before must be changed again, and once more she must bring forth out of her treasury things new as well as old. Above all, he is anxious that the Church, as a whole and in its very widest sense, should perceive the importance of the present crisis, and how far it outweighs the differences which divide communions from one another, or set at variance the individual members of the same communion.

'I speak of the Christian Church. The present attack is levelled in fact at the foundation of the whole Christian Church, not at this or that one of the Christian Churches. When the existence of the supernatural is denied, when the inspiration of Scripture and the Divinity of Jesus Christ are rejected, all Christians—Catholics, Protestants, or Greeks—must feel the blow.

‘I fear that the common danger is not felt in all Christian Churches as clearly, as deeply, as powerfully, as the common safety demands. I fear that while the same questions are everywhere raised, the same attacks everywhere directed against the vital facts and doctrines of the Christian religion, the different Christian communions are not sufficiently concentrating their whole force for the great struggle which all have to sustain. Though the peril is the same for all, yet tradition, habit, and therefore disposition, is different in each. Many Catholics persuade themselves that the faith would be saved if they were but delivered from liberty of thought. Many Protestants believe that they are only using the privilege of free inquiry, and that they continue to be Christians, when they are abandoning the foundations and cutting themselves off from the sources of the faith. Catholicism has not sufficient confidence in its roots, and clings too tightly to every branch; but no tree can always bear good fruit unless it is cultivated and pruned according to the climate and the season; it is the root that we must guard from all touch of harm. Protestantism forgets too much that it also has roots from which it cannot be separated without perishing, and that religion is not an annual which men may cultivate and renew at their caprice. Catholics are too much afraid of liberty, Protestants too much afraid of authority. The one party believes that because religious faith has certain fixed points, religious society is therefore hostile to movement and progress; the other contends that religious society cannot possibly have fixed points, and that religion has its seat in the religious sentiment and the belief of the individual. What would Christianity have become if it had been condemned at its birth to the stagnation upon which the one party insists, and what would become of it now if it were given up, as the other desires, to every caprice of the intellect and every changing wind? Happily at this crisis God does not allow the true principles and the true interests of the Christian religion to remain without effectual defenders. There are Catholics who understand their age and the new state of society, and who frankly accept their religious and political liberty; and they are precisely those who have shown the most courageous attachment to the Catholic faith, who have claimed with the greatest zeal the proper liberties of their Church, and defended with the greatest energy the rights of its head. There are Protestants who have exercised with unwearied zeal all the liberties acquired by Protestantism in the present day; they have been the founders of all the associations and all the agencies which have manifested the life and extended the action of the Protestant Church; they have claimed, and are still incessantly claiming, for this Church, the re-establishment of its synods, which are essential to its religious autonomy. Among these Protestants there have been some who have not found, in the Protestant Church supported by the State, the full satisfaction of their convictions, and they have not hesitated to separate from it and to form free Churches by themselves. And these Protestants, who have so largely exercised all the rights and all the liberties of Protestantism, are precisely those who now, in the trial which Christianity has to sustain within its own bosom, are making the most lofty profession of the doctrines of the Christian faith, and maintaining most firmly the rights of legal authority within their own Church. The liberal Catholics of our day are the most zealous defenders of the traditions and institutions which lie at the foundation of Catholicism. The Protestants who, for the last half century, have been the most active in the exercise of the liberties of Protestantism, are the most decided in asserting its vital doctrines and rules. Humanly speaking, the peaceful issue of the crisis which Christianity has at present to undergo, depends upon the influence which these two classes of Christians are exercising, and will exercise, upon their respective Churches and upon the public. Society among us is certainly far from being Christian; but no more is it anti-Christian; considered as one whole, it cherishes no general or hostile feeling against the Christian religion; it preserves the habits, the instincts, I will

freely say the desires, of Christianity; it knows that Christian faith and Christian law are powerful aids to it in the interests of order and of peace; it is more disquieted than allured by the fanaticism of the enemies of Christianity; it has once tried the experiment of their dominion, and even while it is raising no barrier against them, even while it boasts of them, in its heart it is afraid of their advance. While such a disposition exists, society may still be drawn from its indifference and its ignorance of religion; it may be brought back to Christianity, but only by those who, while defending and propagating Christianity, refrain from wounding society itself in the ideas, the sentiments, the rights, the interests, which have taken their place and struck their root in the centre of its life and activity. Modern society has, like religion, its own fixed points and irresistible tendencies, and harmony can only be re-established between it and religion by the action of men who cherish a deep and genuine sympathy both with the one and with the other. The Christian religion has to live in these days in the presence of liberty; and they alone can be its effectual defenders who, on the one hand, fully profess the Christian faith, and, on the other, frankly accept the trial which liberty causes.'

Such men are to be found already, and in increasing numbers; but will they be allowed to exercise the influence which is their due, will the prophet not be without honour in his own country and among his own kindred?

'If,' says M. Guizot, 'these brave and intelligent champions of the Christian faith were not received and accredited in the Churches to which they belong; if Catholicism were to give reason for the belief that it is essentially hostile to the essential principles and rights of modern society, and that it only tolerates them as Moses tolerated divorce among the Jews, "because of the hardness of their heart"; if, on the other hand, the adversaries of the supernatural, of the inspiration of Scripture, and of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, were to prevail within the bosom of Protestantism, which would then have become a mere philosophy hesitating to assume its real title; if all these evil chances were to come to pass, I am far from thinking that even after such mistakes and amid such reverses the Christian religion would disappear from the world, and finally withdraw its light and its support from men; its destiny is far above the reach of human errors, but certainly, for men to recover from such delusions, for the light once more to enter into their souls, and harmony into modern society, there would be needed over again one of those infinite woes, one of those agonies of revolution, which men must suffer in all the length and depth of their misery, before they can fully learn the lesson which they bring.'

We have not scrupled to quote largely from M. Guizot's preface, because his estimate of the state of France in its religious aspect is, perhaps, more valuable than that of any other person whatever. We may be sure that in his words we have expressed to us the deliberate convictions of a man who possesses unusual means of information upon the subject of which he speaks, and an unusually calm and temperate judgment, which is not likely to lead him far astray. His '*Méditations*,' moreover, are by no means confined to matters which concern his own country alone; it is not merely of the rival French communions that he speaks, and of their local and national struggle with infidelity and rationalism. He rightly perceives

that the battle which they are fighting is but their own peculiar share in the great struggle of the age; that the whole Christian Church in its widest sense has a new lesson to learn, a new war to wage, a new victory to gain. His words, therefore, are universal in their meaning and purpose; if there is any truth in them it is a truth for us, if there is anything to be learned from them we are intended to learn it for ourselves. And certainly the English Church has its full share in the battle of which he speaks. We are no strangers here at home to infidelity, to rationalism, to sentimentalism, to the dangers which arise from political factions without the pale of the Church, and from intestine discord within her bosom. We are tempted, like others, to narrow dogmatism on the one hand, and to an indiscriminate rejection of all dogmatic teaching on the other. A note of warning from a foreign trumpet, and not in the first instance directed to ourselves, may be of infinite service to us if it helps to enlarge our view, to lift us above the littleness of local and individual feeling, by enabling us to discern the magnitude of the struggle. Never was there greater need than now of a firm and unwavering faith in the abiding presence of the Divine Head of the Church, and in the high commission which the Church herself has received from Him to be the blessing of the world. Seldom in the history of the Church have the great questions of the day been more complicated than they are at present; seldom have names and parties and individuals been more strangely intermingled; seldom has it been more impossible to predict beforehand the course which any conspicuous divine or prominent teacher of the Church would adopt in any momentary contest. In such times the hearts of earnest men often fail them 'for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth.' For the air is charged with the elements of doubt and dimness and perplexity. When humble, earnest men see some favourite leader, upon whom they had been accustomed to set their confidence, apparently contradicting his whole past career, and opposing the faith which once he preached, it is to them as if a fixed star had fallen from heaven, and the solid earth was shaken beneath their feet. They 'falter where they firmly trod,' and look helplessly round for something or some one to trust in. Well for them if they do not look in vain. Their help can only come from a deep-seated faith in Him to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth, and in His promise to be with His Church 'always, even unto the end of the world.' The struggles and the difficulties, the faith and the unbelief, the light and the darkness, of every age, do but reveal His presence more clearly, and make it felt more deeply in His

Church. For, as Pascal has beautifully said, '*En Jésus Christ toutes les contradictions sont accordées.*' And if the Church is indeed 'His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all,' there is no want which the human heart can possibly feel which she cannot supply, no question which the human heart can possibly ask which she cannot answer. It rouses our indignation to listen to the anxious fears and misgivings which are so often expressed by those who ought to know better, as if the unbelief of men could shake the throne of God, or the doubt and scepticism of men could separate the King of kings from His Church and Bride. Men may blindly grope and often miss their way, but the darkness is no darkness with Him; and every age of human history, with all its mazes and perplexities, can but interpret one more page of the mysterious book which is in the hand of Him who sits upon the throne; it cannot wrest it from His grasp, or blot out one line of the mighty plan.

Calmly, therefore, and without fear, we look round upon the present and forward into the future. What may be coming we know not, and we need not know. The work of to-day is obvious; not weakly and idly to sit still and complain of the unbelief and scepticism of the age, but boldly to deliver the message of God in the very form in which we are challenged to proclaim it if we can. 'Where is now thy God?' is the question which the age is asking of the Church. Let the answer be given with no trembling voice, 'Here, beneath the deepest reach of your intellect, above the loftiest aspiration of your heart, giving life to your questions and answering them, rousing your desires and satisfying them.' A time of great struggle is a time of great opportunity. If the Church is only true to herself and her mission, she may gain such an intelligent hold upon the heart of the next generation as she has not possessed for many a century. If she coldly ignores or affects to despise the questions of the day, her punishment is certain and severe. 'He that withholdeth corn the people shall curse him, but blessing is upon the head of him that selleth it.'

All honour to M. Guizot for the manner in which he has buckled on his armour, and come down into the arena. He is not the first nor the second who has girded himself with similar arms; but we gladly welcome the new champion as he appears. We honour and welcome him the more because it is not an easy thing for a man who is verging upon eighty to accept the conditions of a new generation. We welcome him none the less because we are conscious of differing widely from him in many points; none the less because we think he has fallen into more than one snare which we ourselves have only escaped by be-

longing, as we do, not merely to a Protestant, but to a Catholic and Apostolic Communion. A noble warrior is bravely fighting for the Church's faith; if we think our own armour is in some points better than his, let the thought make us careful to be *more* than his rivals in the glorious struggle.

At the close of his preface, M. Guizot explains the plan of his work:—

‘These Meditations will be divided into four series. In the first series, which forms the present volume, I lay down and establish what is, in my opinion, the essence of the Christian religion; that is to say, the natural problems to which it responds, the fundamental dogmas by which it resolves these problems, and the supernatural facts upon which these dogmas repose, viz. Creation, Revelation, the Inspiration of Scripture, God as represented in the Bible, Jesus Christ as represented in the Gospel. After the essence of the Christian religion, comes its history; this will be the subject of a second series of Meditations, in which I shall examine the authenticity of the Scriptures, the primary causes of the foundation of Christianity, the Christian faith and Christian Church as they have continuously existed through the lapse of centuries and amid all the vicissitudes of their history, the great crisis which, in the sixteenth century, rent the Christian Church, and divided Europe between Catholicism and Protestantism, and finally the anti-Christian attacks which, at different periods and in different countries, have endangered Christianity, and which it has in every case overcome. The third series of these Meditations will be devoted to the study of the actual state, both internal and external, of the Christian religion. I shall trace the Christian awakening which has taken place among us since the opening of the nineteenth century, both in the Catholic and in the Protestant Church, the rapid rise of the spiritualistic philosophy which occurred at the same period, and the anti-Christian movement which soon after came to light in the revival of materialism, of pantheism, and of scepticism, and in the labours of historical criticism. ‘I shall endeavour to determine what is the idea, and, in my opinion, error, which lies at the foundation of these different systems, explicitly and actively opposed as they are to Christianity. Finally, in the fourth series of these Meditations, I shall make the effort to forecast the future of the Christian religion, and to point out the path by which it is called to achieve the complete conquest, and obtain a moral dominion over this corner of the universe which we call our earth, and in which the purposes of God are exhibited and His power displayed, just as they are, no doubt, also displayed in an infinite number of worlds to us unknown.’

Such is the plan of the work of which the first portion has now been several months before the world. We are far from saying that we look upon the manner in which the plan has been so far carried out as perfect. There are in it imperfections, of which some few, we must honestly confess, excite our surprise, while others give rise only to feelings of affectionate sympathy with the author. But we neither desire nor intend to criticise the work in detail. It is not our purpose in this article to scan narrowly every portion of M. Guizot's armour. We shall endeavour to give the reader some adequate notion of the general course of his argument, and in doing so to offer such suggestions as seem necessary from our own point of view. For in reading such a



work as this, it is very necessary to bear in mind that our point of view is very different from that of the author, and his words may be very well adapted to influence the minds of those for whom he writes, though, if they were addressed to ourselves, they would seem to fall wide of their mark. We wish to say therefore, at once, that where we express a difference from M. Guizot, we do not always mean to imply condemnation. He writes for his own countrymen; we are writing for ours. He desires to exhibit to Frenchmen what he considers to be the essence of the Christian religion; we desire to make use of his words to suggest thought, and aid reflection, in the minds of Englishmen. We heartily wish him success in his labour, which he, probably, understands far better than we do; meanwhile, we are thankful to him for any assistance which he unconsciously gives us in our own.

In the first '*Méditation*,' which is headed '*Les Problèmes naturels*,' he states some of the principal questions which occupy, and have always occupied, the human heart and mind in all ages and in all countries. They are prompted by no mere thirst for knowledge, but spring from a far deeper source. Man, by his very nature, is compelled to ask the secret of his life; he cannot suppress the longing to understand the part which he is playing in the great drama of existence. Such questions as these are questions not of science but of life. '*To be, or not to be, that is the question.*' Whence did I come? Whither am I going? I have a sense of law; does that imply a Law-giver? I call myself free; am I really so? How is my liberty to be reconciled with the control of law? Am I a mere instrument of fate, or a responsible agent? What have I to do with the Judge of all the earth, if He indeed exists? Then the ceaseless struggle between good and evil, order and disorder, joy and sorrow. They seem inseparably interwoven with one another. Are they ever to be put asunder? Is good or evil the normal condition of man and of the world? Why the perpetual adversity of good men? Why the perplexing prosperity of the wicked? Lastly, the conflicting instincts within man himself; so great and yet so petty, so strong and yet so weak, so self-sufficient and yet so helpless. What is the meaning of these alternate impulses of pride and weakness? Is there any explanation of them, or is there none? What is the meaning of prayer? Why *should* we pray; what good can it do?

From these questions, so natural and so peculiar to man, M. Guizot thinks that all religions have derived their birth. They all with less or more distinctness have for their object to satisfy the thirst of man for the resolution of these problems. And as these questions are their source, so the answers which



are given to them are their substance and their foundation. Because man must ask them, therefore he is a religious creature; the brutes are not troubled with them, therefore they have neither need nor capacity for receiving a religion.

M. Guizot then proceeds, in passing, to mention, for the sake of condemning, two modes of dealing with these problems besides that of religion in the sense of that word which has just been explained. The first is one which avoids the effort to give a distinct answer to the tormenting problems, but endeavours to satisfy the soul by 'the religious sentiment,' those beautiful and vague aspirations which are sometimes called the poetry of the soul, above and beyond all contact with the rough realities of life. In this religious sentiment it is often said that the essence of religion chiefly, if not entirely, consists. By its means the soul enters into relationship with the Divine order, and this personal relationship, which is quite independent, and usually very impatient, of all positive dogma, claims to be sufficient for the needs of man; in it is his only true and necessary religion. M. Guizot refuses to admit this claim. The religious sentiment is indeed essential to religion; but religion itself is something more besides. Its mission is to satisfy the needs of the whole man, not his imagination and his affections alone; for he not only feels, but thinks; he longs to know and believe as well as to love; it is not enough for him to feel an emotion and elevation of the soul, he needs the repose of intellectual convictions in harmony with his emotions. He asks for light as well as for sympathy; and if the religious sentiment cannot resolve the moral problems which beset the intellect, it may be a poetry, but it can never be a religion. We need not attempt to decide how far or how long a warm heart and a sincere spirit may avail to fill up the empty void where distinct belief is not, but it is impossible for the soul of man to be permanently satisfied by barren aspirations and beautiful doubts.

We must pause here. There is much in what M. Guizot says which is unquestionably true. We believe we have faithfully given the substance of the two or three pages in which he shortly dismisses the subject of the 'Religious Sentiment.' He is endeavouring to sound great depths, and we confess to the belief that this portion of his work would have been of greater service to the Church and to the Christian religion if he had less speedily concluded that he had reached the bottom. For we question whether he has touched the real need which the 'Religious Sentiment' is supposed to satisfy; and if he has failed to do justice to it, he cannot, upon his own principles, expect to win those who are its advocates. Our thoughts are

not at present occupied with those who turn away from all dogmatic teaching merely from intellectual sloth, who reject the doctrines of Christianity because they do not choose to take the trouble to examine them, and dream away their lives in a luxury of 'sentiment' because they will not brace themselves to any task of manly vigour. Besides these, there are far nobler spirits who fly to the 'Religious Sentiment' as a refuge from intellectual torture. Weary with arguments proving this and contradicting that, the endless controversies in which it seems to them that theologians are perpetually engaged, meeting neither on one side nor the other with the satisfaction for which they long, and feeling at the same time in a very different region, in the very depths of their being, a response to the words of Inspiration, '*My son, give Me thy heart*,' they determine to throw aside all distinct doctrines as seeming but to gender strife and to draw away the soul from Truth, and to listen to that inward Voice and find their rest in the inward sense of a communion with the Speaker. We deeply believe, with M. Guizot, that by this path alone the soul of man cannot attain to settled and abiding rest. For a time it may think itself satisfied, but sooner or later there will be a mighty famine. The question is, Why? If we merely tell them, as he tells them, that the intellect requires satisfaction as well as the heart and affections, they will reply that it may be so, but at all events the heart is above and beneath the intellect and has the first claim upon their attention. If we keep our hearts with all diligence life will issue from them and quicken the whole being; but, on the other hand, the intellect may feel no famine and yet the heart may starve. It is, after all, with the heart that man believeth unto righteousness. It is with the heart that man knows his human friend, and with the heart he knows God. It is true that he asks 'to know' and 'to believe,' but it is to know and to believe a Person, and personal knowledge is a matter of the heart and affections, not of the intellect. When a person is the object, love and sympathy *are* knowledge, and the best and highest kind of knowledge. If we believe in God and love Him with all our hearts, we have already the substance of the whole; He will take care that our intellect finds its satisfaction also.

We cannot see that M. Guizot supplies us with an answer to this. If dogmatic teaching is only needed in order that the intellect may be satisfied as well as the imagination and the affections, a soul which supposes itself to be already in the enjoyment of the peace which passeth all understanding, and transcends the intellect, is not likely to be much attracted by a message bidding it descend once more into the cloudy region

from which it thinks it has escaped, in order that the lower part of its nature may find its satisfaction as well as the higher. We claim for dogmatic teaching a far higher position than this. We require it not only nor chiefly for the intellectual part of man; in this earthly life, at all events, it is indispensable for the continued satisfaction of even our very highest needs. We require it because it is impossible for us to love God with all our heart, unless we also love Him with all our mind. The one is not merely an addition to the other, it is indispensably necessary for the continuance of the other's life. It is true that all personal knowledge is the knowledge which is deeper than words and dwells in the depths of the heart and the spirit. It is true that the thoughts which wander through eternity derive their wings from the imagination and the affections, and not from the intellect. For aught we know, it may be true that when we lay aside this 'vesture of decay' and look with open face upon heavenly things, the imagination and the affections may be sustained in all their clearness and vigour without the aid of the intellect. But so long as we see 'through a glass, darkly,' so long as we are subject to the conditions of this earthly life, experience teaches, and has taught from the dawn of history, that no part of our earthly being, not even the highest, can subsist without the closest dependence upon every other. There are manifold depths of meaning in the words, '*we have this treasure in earthen vessels.*' The Truth which is beheld by the pure in heart, and by the pure in heart alone, cannot be the continued object of vision, cannot be the object of abiding faith, and hope, and trust, and love, unless it clothes itself in forms which are capable of being presented to the mind, and so attains, even for our earthly sight, some portion of the distinctness as well as the glory which it for ever possesses for the eye of the eternal spirit. There may be moments of ecstatic rapture when the soul is lifted into a higher region, 'whether in the body or out of the body it cannot tell,' but what it hears at such moments are 'unspeakable things which it is not lawful for a man to utter.' If such unseen truths are to be the companions of our earthly life, and our guide through the mazes of existence here, they must shape themselves in such a form that we can distinctly recognise them. We cannot know the light of heaven but through the forms and the colours of the earth. The form and the colour are not the light, they are essentially different from it, but it is through them that we see the light and are enabled to walk in its brightness. Again and again has the attempt been made by the human soul to free itself by its own efforts from the conditions which are imposed upon it by our present life, again and again has it seemed to rise above the

clouds and mists of earth, again and again has its shout of triumph been heard, telling us that a region of light has been reached at last, light glorious and all-sufficing, undimmed by form or shadow, and again and again has the soul fallen heavily to the ground in despair; it had but grasped a bright cloud and lost itself in a dazzling mist. Vain are the aspirations of the human heart and bitter their disappointment, if unsustained by the clearness of the understanding. There must be a hand distinctly felt for us to grasp, there must be features clearly seen for us to love; the hand is the pierced hand of the Son of Man, the features are the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

While therefore we heartily agree with M. Guizot when he insists that the whole nature of man is to find its satisfaction in the revelation of God, that the intellect as well as the heart is to enter into its rest with Him for its object, yet we certainly wish that in speaking of the necessity of definite doctrine he had made a bolder claim, and warned the advocates of the 'Religious Sentiment' that, for the sake of what they most desire, they should more earnestly examine the nature of that which they reject. We should imagine that such a warning must be greatly needed in France, we are sure that it is greatly needed in England; for this shadowy 'idealism' and impatience of the distinct articles of the Christian Creed is becoming more and more conspicuously visible here, and has attained a wide-reaching influence among the educated laity. Before it dies out (for we have no fear that it can last long) it may have done much mischief in weakening and enervating the faith of large numbers.

After briefly touching upon the Religious Sentiment, M. Guizot still more briefly alludes to the second mode of meeting the 'Natural Problems' of human nature, viz. the mode adopted by the schools of pantheism and positivism. They meet the needs of human nature by simply denying them. He does not pause to discuss these systems, but passes on to explain the manner in which the same needs are met by the Christian religion.

This forms the subject of the Second '*Méditation*,' which is headed '*Les Dogmes Chrétiens*.' After what we have said in this article upon the absolute necessity of definite doctrines in religion, and the utter impossibility, as a general rule, of sustaining the love of God in the human heart without the aid of clear statements addressed to the intellect, we shall not be supposed to be any favourers of the mere religious sentiment, or suspected of a desire to underrate the importance of dogma. But on this very account we must protest the more strongly

against the assertion that the 'Christian Dogmas' are the answers to the questions which torment the heart of man.

There is something which grates painfully upon the ear in such words as these: 'The dogmas of the Incarnation and of 'Redemption save man from the consequences of evil, and open 'to him in another life the distant vision of re-established order. 'The system indeed is grand, complete, well compacted, and 'powerful. It responds to the appeals of the human heart, 'delivers it from the burden under which it is crushed, and 'gives to it not only the strength which it needs, but the 'satisfaction to which it aspires. Has it a right to so much 'power? Is it legitimate, as well as effectual?' To this question we unhesitatingly reply, It has neither the right nor the power. No dogma, not even a Christian dogma, is able to save man from the consequences of evil; no system, not even a Christian system, can deliver the human heart from the burden under which it is crushed. A dogma, in and by itself, is the very reverse of the spirit that giveth life; it is the letter that killeth. It is the casket in which a heavenly jewel is enshrined, but if we confound it with the jewel itself the mistake is fatal. It is the current coin of the intellect, stamped with an image and superscription which enable it dimly and feebly to represent to us some of the precious things of our Father's house, but if we fancy that it is itself the treasure that we seek, we shall be exiles from our home for ever. We do not accuse M. Guizot of making this mistake. He has fought his way through doubt and perplexity into faith, and none can know so well as he that it is no dogma or system which has given him rest, but a living trust alone in a living God. But not the less do we regret that he has allowed himself to fall into a popular way of speaking of these subjects, which sadly breaks the force and must diminish the usefulness of his book. Until we reach the close, it is only here and there that we feel ourselves in contact with a living Person; nearly always we are put off with a dogma or a system, and told that *that* is to satisfy us and enable us to bear the burden of our life. Everywhere he puts dogma in the place of fact, a system in the place of a person. When he reminds us later on that Jesus spake as never man spake, he explains it by saying that 'the vital principle of the Christian faith, divinity 'and humanity united in Jesus Christ, are shining forth in His 'sentiments and His words. *Le dogme est au fond des préceptes.*' When he speaks of the Love of Christ constraining us to the love of our neighbour, he adds: '*Là est la source, et aussi le 'privilege de la charité chrétienne. C'est le dogme qui fait la 'puissance du précepte.*'

We often hear language like this among ourselves. And yet

we are blessed with a more than sufficient safeguard against the temptation in the Catholic and Apostolic Church to which we belong. For she is a sign and sacrament of the abiding presence of her Lord. Her mere existence is a perpetual assertion that we are saved by no system or dogma, but because we are 'very members incorporate in His mystical body.' The Christian revelation is the revelation of a Head whose members we are, of a Body of which we are a part. If dogmas help us to accept, and to retain, and to proclaim this truth, let us thankfully make use of them, and hold fast our form of sound words; but in themselves they are no bond of union, and have no saving power. To the true bond of union, the true saving power, the union and communion of the members of the Body with each other and with their Head, the Church bears perpetual testimony, but it is forgotten by the sects at the very first moment of their separation. It is M. Guizot's misfortune, not his fault, that he belongs to a communion which is established upon a dogmatic '*Confession*,' and that therefore he is led to speak of dogmas in language which can hardly be in accordance with his own deepest feelings. It will be our fault and not our misfortune if we allow ourselves to fall into the same mistake. This matter is of far greater importance than we are apt to suppose. Our perpetual use of abstract terms is full of peril. It is totally inconsistent with vigorous life. As long as we speak of the '*Christian Religion*' rather than the Christian Church, of the '*Divine Founder of Christianity*' rather than a living and present Saviour, we have no right to complain if others go a little further, and tell us that we are saved by '*ideas*,' that the historical facts of Scripture are needless, and a living God an unnecessary assumption.

M. Guizot proceeds to say what are, in his opinion, the fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion:—

'I must ask for myself the indulgence both of Catholic and Protestant divines. It is not my purpose here to mention, or to explain, or to support, all the points of doctrine, all the articles of faith, to which they have given the name of Christian dogmas. During the eighteen centuries of its existence, Christian theology has very often ventured beyond the limits of the Christian religion; men have not scrupled to mingle their works with the work of God. This is but the natural consequence of human activity combined with human imperfection, a combination which has produced similar results in every period of history, and particularly in the history of that society and of that religion, upon which the religion of Christ was engrafted by God. The faith and the law of the Jews when Jesus Christ was born were no longer simply the faith and the law which God had given them by Moses; it had been very greatly modified, enlarged, and altered, by Pharisees, Sadducees, and others. And Christianity, too, has had its Pharisees and Sadducees; in its turn it has had to undergo the effects of the labours of human thought and human passion moulding and changing the divine revelation. I cannot allow that the results of this human handiwork have a right to be considered a part



of the dogmas of Christianity. Still I do not now propose to mark out separately, and to contest, all that I do not accept and cannot therefore defend in the Christian Church and Christian Theology. It is not becoming for me, and I venture to say it is not becoming for any Christian, to be busily criticising the interior walls of the building whose foundations are so fiercely attacked; I would much rather rally all the inhabitants together for the common defence of the whole, and I shall speak here of those dogmas only which are common to all. I sum them up in these terms: Creation, Providence, Original Sin, the Incarnation, Redemption. In these is the essence of the Christian religion, and whoever believes these dogmas I count a Christian.'

To these five fundamental dogmas the five sections of this second Meditation are devoted. In ten or twenty pages under the head of each M. Guizot explains the meaning in which he accepts it, shows how he believes it to meet some one or more of the problems of the human heart, and touches very briefly, but very ably, upon the principal objections made to it in the present day. In this Meditation there are many passages of great interest, and suggestive of deep thought. A few quotations may serve as specimens of the whole.

He is speaking of Providence and of Prayer:—

'Providence is the natural and necessary development of the existence of God. It is the constant presence and continued activity of God in creation. With this supreme fact the universal and irresistible instinct which drives man to prayer is in entire harmony; whoever believes in God at all cannot help flying to Him for refuge in prayer. But objections are raised to this in the name of God Himself. "He acts," men tell us, "by general and fixed laws; how then can we ask Him for particular and arbitrary determinations of will? He is unchangeable, ever perfect, and ever the same; how can we conceive that He will lend Himself to the fluctuations of human feelings and human desires? To utter a prayer to Him is to forget His very essence." And so they place the nature of God in opposition to His providence. This objection, so often reproduced, never ceases to fill me with astonishment. For it is urged by the very men who, for the most part, proclaim at the very same moment that God is above our comprehension, and that we cannot penetrate the secret of His nature. But what is their argument itself but an assumption that they can comprehend God, and what right can they have to oppose His nature to His providence, if His nature is, for us, an impenetrable mystery? I do not reproach them for their ambition; it is the privilege and glory of mankind; but while they guard it jealously let them not mistake the limits of its power; they must take their choice—either give up belief in God because He is incomprehensible, or, while they believe in Him, frankly acknowledge that they cannot comprehend Him. They have no right to pass backwards and forwards from one system to another, at one moment declaring God to be incomprehensible, and the next moment treating Him, His nature, and His attributes, as if He were included in the domain of human science.

'However great the question of Providence may be, that upon which I am now touching is greater still, for it bears upon the very existence of God, and the point at issue is, at bottom, to determine whether He is or is not. God is at one and the same time light and mystery, in intimate relationship with man and yet beyond the limits of his science. I shall presently endeavour to decide what the limit of human science is, and what is its legitimate domain; but at this moment I content myself with asserting that whoever believes in God and



pronounces Him to be incomprehensible, and at the same time persists in the endeavour to bring Him within the definitions of science, and so expects to pierce the admitted mystery, that person runs great risk of destroying his own belief, and in his own mind reducing God to nothing, which is but one mode of denying His existence.

Again, he is speaking of the Incarnation:—

‘It is a great source of error in the study of the facts of history, when men forget their general and essential features, in the rigid examination of those which are but partial and secondary. On the subject of the Godhead of Jesus Christ, that fundamental principle of the Christian religion, they may contest the precise sense and bearing of this or that word; they may pronounce this or that phrase of this or that Gospel, of this or that Epistle, to be an interpolation, but there will still remain infinitely more than is sufficient to establish the truth, that those who in these days believe in the Godhead of Jesus Christ do but believe what the Apostles believed and said, and what the Apostles believed and said that Jesus Christ said to themselves, nineteen centuries ago. Those who deny the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ equally mistake both man and history, the complicated elements of human nature as well as the significance of those great facts which mark the religious life of mankind. What is man himself but an incarnation of God, incomplete and imperfect though it be? No one can consistently reject the Christian doctrine except the materialists who deny the existence of the soul, and the naturalists who deny the creation. If you believe that spirit and matter are distinct, if you do not believe that man is produced by the fermentation of matter or the transformation of species, you cannot help admitting the divine element in human nature, you must necessarily accept the words of Genesis, “God created man in His own image;” that is, you accept the presence of God in feeble and fallible man. In the history of every religion, and in every mythology, the grossest and the most refined, I meet at every step the idea and the assertion of the incarnation of God. Brahmanism, Buddhism, Paganism, every form of religious creed and of idolatry, abound in incarnations of every kind and every date, primitive or otherwise, mixed up with this or that event of history, made use of to explain this or that fact, to satisfy this or that human inclination. It is the universal and natural instinct of man to represent to himself the action of God upon the human race under the form of the incarnation of God in man.’

Once more, he is speaking of Redemption. After reminding us that sacrifices are found to be offered, in one shape or other, among all nations of the earth, he proceeds thus:—

‘Another moral fact there is besides, not less real, though more strange to the eyes of superficial reason. Men have believed that a sin could be expiated by those who have not committed it, and that innocent victims might be offered to pacify God and to save the guilty. Hence have arisen sacrifices as absurd as they have been atrocious, and the so-called expiation has often been but one crime the more. But hence have arisen also acts of the loftiest heroism, the most sublime devotion. The domestic history of families, the public history of nations, exhibit noble examples of innocence offering itself in sacrifice, bearing penance, suffering, and death, to expiate the crime of another, to satisfy the justice of God, and obtain the pardon of the sinner. Is all this only a pious and generous mistake, a devotion as vain as it is beautiful? Nothing more than this it is in the eyes of those who believe in no Providence, in no prayer, in no effectual relation between the actions of men and the decrees of God, in no cohesion (*solidarité*) of men with one another, in no connecting link between the sacrifice of him who offers himself up and the

destiny of him for whom the offering is made. But those who cherish a faith in the living God, in His continued presence and His active providence; those who believe that nothing of good or of evil is without result on the part of man, and that every moral action bears its fruit, whether seen or unseen, far or near, cannot but feel that, in the voluntary sacrifice of the innocent for the deliverance of the guilty, there is a mysterious power, of which it is not granted to them to penetrate the secret, but which kindles in their souls the hope that this sublime devotion will never be allowed to miss its aim.'

'From these human feelings and actions, of which no one can deny the reality, I pass to the Christian dogma. In view of the devotion and the sacrifice of the human being who is innocent, and who desires to expiate the crime of the human being who is guilty, I place the devotion and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ the God-Man, to redeem the human race from sin, and to open to it the way of salvation. Who can fail to be struck by the sublime analogy? What a close connexion, what an entire harmony, between the purest and most generous instincts of the human soul and the dogma of Divine redemption! I touch upon none of the questions, I enter into none of the controversies, to which this dogma has given rise; I am not weighing faith and works in opposite scales; I make no effort to adjust the claims of the grace of God and the virtue of man; I have no desire to mark out or to count the number of the elect; I take my stand upon the simple fact of the redemption of Jesus Christ, the fact upon which the dogma is founded. What the most glorious heroes and saints of the human race have sometimes attempted, to expiate the sins of this or that creature, of this or that nation, Jesus Christ, the Elect of God, the Son of God, the God-Man, has come to accomplish for all mankind, at the cost of sorrows, humiliations, sufferings, beyond compare.'

We cannot help adding the closing words of this Meditation, as an instance of the want which we lately pointed out. Almost immediately after the deeply suggestive words which we have just quoted, after a further glowing reference to the glorious Victim and the mighty Sacrifice, M. Guizot proceeds to give us its result. And what is the result? Not a redeemed world—not man reconciled to God—not a door opened in heaven never to be shut again, and trust in a living God at last revealed—not even the existence of a Catholic Church on earth to bear witness to the presence of the King of kings, but 'the result has been *the Christian religion*; this incomparable system of facts, of dogmas, of precepts, and of promises, which, in the midst of all the doubts and all the controversies of the intellect of man, still responds, after nineteen centuries, to the religious instincts of his nature and the religious problems by which he is beset.'

'Le Surnaturel' is the title of the third Meditation. 'To a system so grand, and in such perfect harmony with human nature, an objection is raised which is supposed to be final; the system proclaims the supernatural; the supernatural is its foundation and its first principle. Now, we are told, the supernatural has no existence.' It is in the name of science that this objection is raised. M. Guizot would pay 'infinite' honour to science. He only wishes it to be pursued more strictly, in a manner more in accordance with its own principles; that it

should not be carried away by the apparent successes of the moment, but should be more patient in the investigation of the facts and ideas which connect themselves with the questions of which it treats, and which must not be left out of the account if those questions are to be answered. The belief in the supernatural is a natural fact, fixed immovably in the life and history of the human race, forcing itself irresistibly even upon those who are most determined to escape from it. What does this mean? Science must answer the question. The very existence of man is a proof of the supernatural, for he is supernatural himself. By virtue of his moral freedom he is exalted above the laws of nature; the exertion of his will produces effects which are not the consequence of any pre-existing law; and these effects take place in an order absolutely distinct from the order by which the visible world is ruled. The moral freedom of man is a fact as certain and as natural as the order of nature, and yet it is at the same time supernatural, essentially foreign to the order and the laws of nature. The adversaries of the Supernatural deny the very constitution of their own being, and in the name of science destroy science. If by any possibility they could succeed in their object, and trample out of the heart of man the belief in that which is above nature—if the place which is occupied by Christian faith were to be found empty, imagination cannot picture the degradation and confusion into which mankind would fall. For its one only stay and support is a hope, however sometimes obscured, and a belief however wavering, in supernatural power and supernatural order.

After stating and answering Hume's famous objection to miracles, our author concludes thus:—'The fundamental mistake of the adversaries of the supernatural is that they combat it in the name of human science, and include it among the facts which belong to the domain of science. It does not belong to this region, and the wish to include it within its limits has compelled them to deny its existence.'

This leads to the subject of the next '*Méditation*,' which is headed '*Les Limites de la Science*,' and in which M. Guizot enters upon what is perhaps the most important, as well as the most engrossing, question of the present time. Are there any limits to human science? If there are, have we any means of knowing what lies beyond them, or does hopeless darkness commence at the point where science ends? The chapter begins with a rather lengthy quotation from Dr. Chalmers's *Natural Theology*, in which Chalmers, after a warm and even enthusiastic commendation of true science, its tentative method and its modest confidence in the certainty of its conclusions, proceeds to point out that science itself declares that there are limits

which it cannot pass ; it gives hints of forms and facts which are beyond its scope, but of them it can distinguish nothing. M. Guizot defines these limits. He pronounces the domain of science to be co-extensive with the finite world, including under this name not only the world of matter, but also that moral order which is subject to our observation. For he does not deny that the study of man in his actual condition, individually and collectively, is a scientific study, subject to the same method as the study of the material world, and capable of discovering the laws which regulate the facts which it observes. But the human spirit is not confined within the limits of human science. It aspires after the infinite, the perfect, the unchangeable, the eternal, and it has ideas which correspond to these aspirations. The intellect may recognise the existence of these ideas and these aspirations, but there it must stop ; it cannot reduce them within its own conceptions, and form a science of which they are the object. The spirit can catch a glimpse of the infinite, and aspire thereto, but the infirmity of man's actual condition restricts his science to the finite world in which he dwells.

'I was born in the sunny South, but I have mostly lived in the north country, which is so often shrouded in mist. When I turn my eyes towards the horizon, under this pale sky, the fog is sometimes dense, sometimes light ; but, whether dense or light, it is for ever limiting my view ; my eye might carry further, but an external obstacle is in its way ; the want of light renders it useless to me. Now look for the horizon under the clear bright sky of the South ; light is streaming far and near over the plains, my eye can see as far as it can reach ; if it sees no further, it is not that light is wanting, it is that its own power of vision has reached its limit. The mind knows well that there are regions beyond, but the eye cannot attain to them. This is a figure of what happens to the intellect in the contemplation and the study of the universe ; it reaches a point where its clear view, its science, must cease. This is not the limit of creation, it is the limit of the scientific power of man. Other realities appear to him, he catches a glimpse of them, he believes in them naturally and spontaneously, but he can neither grasp them nor measure them ; he can form no conception of them either true or false ; he can reduce them to no science, yet he cannot help having faith in them.'

There is much force and much beauty in this illustration, and we have no desire to criticise it minutely. An illustration can seldom in all respects exactly suit the requirements of the truth which it is intended to illustrate, and we believe we have satisfactorily gathered M. Guizot's meaning from the rest of this chapter. Still this is a subject upon which in these days we cannot afford to give an uncertain sound, and both for the sake of bringing out more fully what we believe to be the author's meaning, and still more for the sake of clearly explaining our own, we must be allowed to make one remark. It is not distance that makes it impossible for the intellect to grasp eternal things. It is not that having reached a certain limit it

is wearied out and can go no further, though the objects beyond it are the same in kind as those which it has already grasped, so that a powerful intellect might behold more of them than a weaker, just as a farsighted person can see further than another. It is that though the intellect is fully equipped and suited to its own purpose, to enable man to play his part in the finite world, that purpose concerns but indirectly the world of spiritual things. And the very constitution of the intellect, not its want of power, makes it impossible for it to look upon them. It is a faculty, not an eye. It can arrange, and marshal, and order, and argue, but it cannot *see*. The *spirit* of man must deal with spiritual things, and the eye of the spirit is faith. That eye unassisted is dim. Whether assisted or not, it must strain itself to search for the spirit's home. But its vision, since the spirit's fall, is tormented by the spectres of evil within and around itself.

‘Our eyes see all around in gloom or glow,  
Hues of their own, fresh borrowed from the heart.’

And the eye of the spirit is confused by the consciousness of guilt and by the strife within, by the hopes of an immortal life and the fears of eternal death. It is formed and fitted to look on God, but it has now to pierce through a horror of great darkness. Is there any light to meet it from the other side? Is there any ray to guide it through the gloom? Is there a ‘*Light of the world*?’ This we believe to be the question which, more than any other, haunts the minds of men in the present day. It is vain to tell them that the spirit world is a sacred region which the intellect may not approach, unless we also tell them that they may enter into it, and know it, by that in them which is as far above the intellect as heaven is above the earth.

This leads us to the subject of M. Guizot's next ‘*Méditation*,’ viz. ‘*La Révélation*.’ There is something striking in his argument that a Revelation of some kind, and to some extent, must needs have been given from the first.

‘When man entered for the first time into the world, he did not enter, he could not enter, as a new-born infant endowed merely with the breath of life. He was created full grown, with instincts and faculties complete and vigorous, and fit for immediate action. One must deny creation, and fall into the most chimerical theories, or else admit that the human being which is now developed slowly and painfully, was in the first instance at once entire and complete. Creation, therefore, implies a revelation—a revelation which enlightened man at his very entrance into the world, and placed him in a position to display from the very first day his faculties and his instincts. Are we to imagine the first man, the first couple, endowed with complete physical development, and yet deprived of the essential conditions of intellectual activity, materially vigorous, but morally nothing; a body as of twenty years, with a soul in its first infancy? Such a thing is contradictory in itself and impossible for us to conceive.’

'What was the extent of this revelation which of necessity accompanied Creation? None can tell. I open the Book of Genesis, and I find,

"The Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him. And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

'According to the Bible, then, primitive revelation bore essentially upon three points, man's duty of obedience to his Maker, marriage, and language; Adam received from God the moral law of his liberty, the companion of his life, and the gift of naming the creatures which surrounded him; that is to say, the three sources of religion, of the family, and of science, were immediately opened to him. I need not enter here into any of the questions which have been raised upon the human sources of language, upon the constitution of the family and its influence upon the organization of society; the limits of the primitive revelation cannot be scientifically determined, but the fact that it was given is certain. It was the light which guided the first step of man in life, and without which we cannot conceive that he could have lived at all.'

This first revelation was not only the guide of the first man on his entrance into the world, but it became the abiding inheritance of the race. Among all peoples and in all ages it is found, showing itself in thoughts and ideas which could have had no earthly source, in instincts and aspirations which were the result of no human teaching. The progress of the human intellect, the institutions which have governed the world, the systems which men have formed, the religions which have taken root from time to time, have had their point of departure in this primitive revelation, which was the first gift of God. But in the midst of this general revelation, which was thus spread through all mankind, history presents us with an additional fact. It tells us of a special revelation within the bosom of a petty nation, confined for sixteen centuries in a narrow corner of the earth, and issuing forth at last, conquering and to conquer, to shed its light upon the whole human race. It has become the Christian religion. How does it enable us to recognise that it comes from God? The Christian revelation affirms that the documents in which it is written are themselves of divine origin:—'The inspiration of Scripture is the foundation of Christian faith; it is the title under which the Christian religion lays claim to its authority over the human soul.' What does it mean?



'I have read the Scriptures again and again. I have read them for the most different purposes, and in the most varied moods of mind; sometimes I have studied them as great monuments of history, sometimes I have admired them as sublime works of poetry. In reading them, the impression upon my mind has always been very different to one of curiosity or admiration. I have felt myself in the presence of a word quite other than that of a chronicler or a poet, and under the influence of a breath which has come from no human source.

'The Bible is not a poem in which man relates and sings the adventures of his gods, mingled with his own; it is an actual drama, a continual dialogue between God and man, collectively personified in the Hebrew people. On the one side is the will and the action of God, on the other, the liberty and the faith of man; sometimes in harmonious union, sometimes in fatal disagreement. The more I read the Scriptures, the more astonished I am that all earnest readers do not receive the same impression as myself, and that so many mistake its characterizing feature of divine inspiration, so foreign to every other book, so striking in this. That men who deny altogether the supernatural action of God in the world should refuse to see it in the Bible, is intelligible enough. But the attacks upon the inspiration of Scripture proceed from another cause, far more plausible and more infectious. It is not without deep regret that I am about to express my dissent from traditions which are ancient and worthy of all respect, and perhaps to wound convictions which are both earnest and sincere. But my deliberate conviction is stronger than my regret. And it is stronger still, because I am also at the same time convinced that the system which I wish to combat has done, is always doing, and may still do, infinite mischief to the Christian religion.

'Whoever reads without prejudice the original texts, Hebrew and Greek, of the Old and New Testaments, meets in them often, among their sublime beauties, I will not say only with faults of style, but with faults of grammar, with the violation of the natural and logical rules of language, which exist in every separate language. Are we to be told that these faults are of the same origin as the doctrines with which they are mingled, that the one as well as the other was inspired by God?

'Yet this claim is made upon us by pious and learned men, who maintain that everything, absolutely everything, in the Scriptures is of divine inspiration, the words as well as the ideas, every word upon every subject, the material of the language as well as the deep significance of the doctrine. In this assertion I can but see a deplorable confusion by which both the meaning and the object of the inspiration of Scripture are deeply misconceived, and its authority gravely compromised. It has not been the will of God, by this supernatural method, to teach men grammar, or geology, or astronomy, or geography, or chronology. It is their relation to their Creator, their duties to Him and to one another, the rule of their faith and of their life, that He has enlightened for them with His divine torch. Religion and morality alone, not any human science, are concerned in the inspiration of Scripture.'

We confess we are astonished at the particular point which M. Guizot places at the head and front of his difficulty. We should have thought that the small details of the language itself, the violations of grammatical propriety, were the very last and least of the sources of perplexity which beset the theory of what is called the 'plenary verbal inspiration' of Scripture. It is a novelty to us that any one can be seriously troubled because the same noun substantive is used as a masculine and afterwards as feminine 'within three pages' of the



Apocalypse, or that a masculine adjective is made to agree with a feminine substantive, or an adjective in the nominative case with a substantive in the accusative, even though we add to this the fact, which cannot be denied, that the more carefully and completely ancient manuscripts are studied and collated, the more numerous are these violations of grammar discovered to be.

M. Guizot afterwards adds:—

‘Nothing is further from my thoughts than to find in the Scriptures only a collection of images and poetic symbols; these books are the very light and voice of God upon the religious problems which beset mankind. But this light reveals, this voice declares, only the relations which exist between God and men, the duties which He imposes upon them in the course of their present life, and the prospect which He opens to them beyond this limited and imperfect world in which life is passed. As to this world itself, and the laws by which it is regulated, it is the object of human study and human science, not of the inspiration of Scripture. When men have not perceived this limit, when they have ascribed to the language in which the Scriptures speak of the phenomena of the finite world the character of Divine inspiration, they have fallen into the most deplorable errors both of thought and action. Hence came the arraignment of Galileo and a vast number of judgments still more absurd and still more calamitous, in which the Christian religion was placed at issue with human science, and compelled now to give, now to receive from it, the most direct contradiction. Hence proceed in our own day the many objections which are raised against Christianity in the name of the natural sciences, and which, from the learned circles where they originate, spread themselves through a world at once inquisitive and frivolous, and cause the faith of a Christian to be locked upon as credulous ignorance. Nothing of the kind would have been possible, no such conflict would have awaited the Christian religion, if on the one side the limits of human science, and, on the other, those of Divine inspiration, had received the recognition which truth requires, and the respect which they had a right to demand.’

After considering the Inspiration of Scripture, M. Guizot proceeds to the consideration of its contents. This occupies the two *Méditations* which conclude this series, and which are headed ‘Dien selon la Bible,’ and ‘Jésus Christ selon l’Evangile.’ In considering the Revelation of God which is given in the Bible, he properly starts from the ‘*I am that I am*,’ by which God made Himself known to Moses. He protests against the miserable interpretation by which this great Name is reduced to a mere proclamation of a hungry abstraction, such as ‘the Unity of the Godhead,’ or the ‘self-existent Being.’ He contends that the revelation was not only or chiefly of Unity or Self-existence, but of the Righteous One, the Unchangeable, the Eternal Spirit. Having laid this strong foundation, he goes on to show how the Righteous God revealed himself step by step in the great drama of history, how the changing and reluctant spirit of man was made unconsciously to work out the one purpose of his unchanging Creator, how one particular people was chosen out of the world to be the representative and depository of the Life

which was to regenerate mankind. We need not follow him in detail through the several stages of this *Méditation*. The headings of its sections will sufficiently show the track of his thoughts. They are as follows:—‘Dieu et Abraham,’ ‘Dieu et Moïse,’ ‘Dieu et les Rois,’ ‘Dieu et les Prophètes,’ ‘L’attente du Messie.’

In the last *Méditation* of all, he is in immediate contact with the great questions which are at present agitating the religious world of France. He pursues, however, the same method as before, dwelling with more or less brevity upon some few of the leading features of the life of Christ; thus:—‘Jésus Christ et ses Apôtres,’ ‘Jésus Christ et ses préceptes,’ ‘Jésus Christ et ses miracles,’ ‘Jésus Christ, les Juifs, et les Gentils,’ ‘Jésus Christ et les femmes,’ ‘Jésus Christ et les enfants,’ ‘Jésus Christ lui-même.’

‘In the child Jesus did the union of humanity and divinity, of natural and miraculous life, commence its self-manifestation. And this is His proper character. To any one who rejects the very principle of the supernatural, this union, and, therefore, the person of Jesus Christ, is incomprehensible and inadmissible. And why should we be surprised if we meet with such opponents in these days? He met with them in His own lifetime, met them among His contemporaries, within His own family; His mother Mary looked upon Him in His childhood, and did not understand Him. And yet “Mary kept all these things in her heart.” Deep and touching word! in it is to be seen the complicated mystery of human nature: Man cannot be content to remain within the limits and the laws of the finite world, but is ever aspiring higher; and yet, when he is called to rise above the present order of nature, he is surprised, hesitates, and doubts whether he may believe in the supernatural, upon which he was calling the moment before, and upon which he will never cease to call, for, like Mary, he has the instinct thereof in his heart. Now, as much as nineteen centuries ago, is Jesus Christ called upon to deal with these contradictory dispositions of man. He is in the presence of this thirst for the supernatural which possesses the human spirit, and in the presence too, of all the objections and all the doubts to which the supernatural gives rise in the human intellect.

He has to satisfy the longing. He has to overcome the doubt. The Gospel is the opening of the history of this solemn struggle which at first created, and which still agitates, the Christian world.’

We have quoted these words for two reasons. They are a noble exception to the statement which we felt called upon to make in an earlier page of this article, that M. Guizot’s book deals with systems and dogmas where it should deal with a Person. In this passage at all events we are not told that *the Christian Religion* can satisfy the longing of the human heart, or overcome the doubts of the human intellect. The King is here among our disputes and controversies, keeping no ‘silent watch’ as He sits upon His throne. He is present in the Church, ‘sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions.’ He is dealing with the doubts and difficulties of these latter days. The most timid of us may well be reassured, for ‘the Lord is King, be the people never so im-

'patient: He sitteth between the Cherubims, be the earth never so unquiet.'

But we have quoted this passage for another and a stronger reason. We believe that M. Guizot has here laid his hand upon the real source of the present contest. The appearance of 'God manifest in the flesh' might well shake this finite world to its centre. And it did. '*Who is this?*' was the question which from that moment onward thrilled through the ages. 'We beheld His glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the 'Father' is the Church's continued answer. The answer is addressed to the spirit and the heart of man, and it satisfies them, but to the understanding the problem remains as insoluble as ever, for it is above its sphere. The mystery of the connexion of spirit with matter, of the very existence of spirit, of our own spiritual nature, culminates and reaches its highest point in the Incarnation of the Lord. His appearance in the flesh was the most complete contradiction which could be given to the haughty claim put forward by the Intellect to comprehend all existence within its domain. The phenomena which necessarily accompanied it were in obedience to a law which was not generalised from the world of sense, a law which is above and beneath the intellect, to which the intellect cannot soar and which it cannot fathom. Hence the desperate effort made on the one side to bring the events of the Gospel History within the scope of mere natural laws, or on the other to deny the truth of the History altogether. There is no contradiction too absurd for the human intellect temporarily to accept rather than allow that the whole series of events is above its grasp. Theory after theory is formed and stretched until it breaks in the vain effort to comprehend the marvellous Whole. From the first century onward to the nineteenth the strain has continued. The mind will not be released from its impossible task. The world will not be content with the Church's simple answer to the great question, though it has never been able to find one for itself which could last a generation. Its systems, one by one, have had their day and ceased to be. They have denied the Godhead only to find the Manhood unintelligible. They have refused to acknowledge the Infinite Wisdom, but then they have to account for the beauty of Holiness. They have called Him a charlatan, but whence then the actions 'full of grace and truth'? They have called Him a dreamer, but how have His dreams had power to transform the world? They have pronounced our narratives to be a collection of myths, but what then was the foundation upon which the myths were raised? That Birth and Life and Death and Resurrection remain unmoved among the facts of history. The rain has descended, and the floods have

come, and the winds have blown against them, only to leave them more absolutely certain than they seemed before. And the Church must be prepared to meet this struggle in forms perpetually renewed. For these two antagonistic forces of human nature can never in this world cease their play. The longing for the supernatural, which is deeply implanted in man's heart, will always lend to this question a mysterious and irresistible attraction; while, on the other hand, the dread of the supernatural will always bring the temptation to deny or to doubt or to explain away the whole.

We are glad to think that we are taking only a temporary leave of M. Guizot. If our language regarding him has once or twice been that of dissent, it has certainly not for a moment been other than that of cordial good-will.

---

- ART. II.—1. *The Conversion of the Roman Empire*: the Boyle Lectures for the Year 1864, delivered at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons. Second Edition. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Paternoster Row.
2. *The Formation of Christendom*. By T. W. ALLIES. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Paternoster Row.
3. *The Fifteenth Chapter of Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.
4. *Three Introductory Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*. By WILLIAM LEE, D.D. Archdeacon of Dublin.

WE place ourselves in thought before the outer veil of the Temple at Jerusalem, at the beginning of our era, and with the other worshippers wait for the coming forth of the priest. We hear the sweet music of the bells upon his vesture as he pursues his unseen ministry; and we can catch the perfume of the ascending incense. At last the long-lingering priest appears; but though his hands be raised and joined for benediction, no word of blessing falls from his lips. Another *Voice* is coming, and with it comes the *Word*. Forty years pass away, and among the crowd of devotees in that same place one is praying who hears that Word bidding him go far away to the Gentiles with his apostolical commission. The vivid pictures of the sanctuary, the palace, and the sea dissolve, and we discover S. Paul making his defence at Rome.<sup>1</sup> Upon that narrow isthmus between heathendom and revelation we see him stand, not indeed silent, as he who stood 'silent upon a peak at Darien,' but in such fashion rather as to recall the affecting picture of the imperial captive looking at sunset across the waters towards the land he loved so well. There are few things grander where all is grand, than the manner of the ending of the last historical book of the New Testament. Archdeacon Wordsworth, with his usual

<sup>1</sup> We cannot but regret that Mr. Plumptre in his ingenious and admirable poem did not bring forward S. Paul as the personage of S. Mark xiv. 51. The age of this young man, his rich attire, bespeaking him a scrupulous observer of the law, and his ascetic manner of life at the eve of the great festival are points which coincide in imparting a great appearance of probability to this speculation. According to Mr. Plumptre the young man is Lazarus.

felicitous accuracy, calls attention to the solemn rhythmical cadence of the last word. May we not add that the word itself is freighted with the decrees of God, and that the ἀκωλύτως foretells unto the end the irresistible progress and vitality of the Faith?

There is in fact, if it be not profane to say it, the severest Epic unity in the writings of S. Luke, a unity which embraces and suggests the last great theme which seems left to us for true Epic poetry. The Conversion of the Roman Empire has presented itself, as such a theme, to at least one great master of song. But the appearance of a true Epic in this age is as inconceivable, and we fear the world would say as undesirable, as the re-appearance of Milton himself.

But Mr. Merivale, by the vividness of his pencil and the picturesqueness of his phrase, has done justice, albeit, as perhaps he might himself express it, only *pedestrian* justice, to his lofty theme. His style has all the fulness of Johnson's.<sup>1</sup> There is the same measured utterance, long drawn out and wave-like; like the waves, too, in that occasionally felt monotony which never yet was unwelcome to a well-trained ear. The main difficulty which the subject presents is its definition. What was the conversion of the Roman Empire? and when was the Roman Empire converted? The expression, the conversion of an empire, invariably suggests for its interpretation the conversion of an individual; an event which supplies a ready answer to the when? and where? Now there are some who dare affirm that the dominion of Alexander survived its disintegration, who have no difficulty in asserting that the Roman Empire continues to this day: but when we remember that it took well-nigh five centuries to evangelise the seaboard of the Mediterranean, the question whether the Roman Empire *ever* was converted will scarcely outdo in boldness the speculations we have just quoted. Mr. Merivale seems conscious of the difficulty that meets him in the definition of his thesis. 'It is the history of religion (Christianity) brought into one focus.' (Pref. p. i.) The expression is happy; but does it impart greater distinctness to our ideas? Can we venture to affirm that Christianity was brought into a focus before the excommunication of the Macedonian heresy, or sooner than the last of the great Œcumenical councils? If we may judge from the use which our author makes of the Council of Nicæa (p. 13), we are bound

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Merivale is occasionally over fond of Latin forms. *Proletaria* and *Obsolescence* may present no difficulty to ordinary readers. But as every French dictionary may not contain the noun *cadastre*, and as no English lexicon we have been able to lay hands on contains the word *cadastral*, we do, in the interest of our lazy readers, if we have any such, protest against such a phrase as 'Cadastral Map' (p. 75) for the easier expression *survey* or *terrier*.

to conclude that he regards that as the critical point of the conversion which forms the subject of these lectures. If, indeed, the 318 Bishops at Nicæa had constituted a great parliament of the empire, under a Christian emperor; if this parliament was also its own executive; if its writ ran in all places, overriding all heathen usage; if its rites were imposed irresistibly on all peoples, nations, and tongues; in this case, indeed, in consideration of the supposed representative nature of such a body or senate, we might with some propriety speak of the year of grace 325 as marking the conversion of the Empire of Rome. But what is the fact? Christianity was more tolerated, perhaps, but it was not more established and imperialized in 325 than in 313, the date of the memorable Edict of Milan. Half a century later we find the Emperor Gratian the first to act on the profession of Christianity.<sup>1</sup> And what a scanty gathering out of a converted empire must we account the Nicene Bishops! The Church is for ever indebted to those ever-memorable Fathers; but the history of that critical epoch can leave no doubt on the impartial reader, that at the date of the assembly of that Council, the imperial area of the Church was very far indeed from being occupied; and that, as employed of such a time, the expression 'conversion of the Roman Empire' is neither philosophical, nor yet accurate, nor yet true. He who laboured so zealously in 'sapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer,' is more faithful to the logic of history when speaking under this date of 'the progress of the Christian religion,' and the 'rapid growth of the Christian Church.' We heartily believe that the whole surface of human society was even then sown with the eternal seed of the Gospel, and that Christ, even at that early date, was worshipped where the Eagles of Rome had never been seen or heard of. What we contend for is, that in the then-existing circumstances of the Empire, under no legitimate use of the term can we speak of a conversion of the Empire as having either then taken place, or as having then been consummated.<sup>2</sup>

We shall go a step further, and deliver our whole paradox. In that very event which uncritical readers are accustomed to regard as deciding beforehand this very question, we on the other hand find the fullest disproof of the whole theory we are

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lee (46) then discerns the beginning of the triumph of Christianity.

<sup>2</sup> Acquaintance with the facts of history would have saved many of our Apocalypticists from an erroneous exegesis. Thus Rev. vi. 2, where we have portrayed 'victory and nothing but victory' (Hengst.) in language which 'describes vividly increasing progress' (Ewald), would never have been understood to describe the rapid subjugation of the Roman Empire to the religion of the Cross, were the sober facts of the progress of Christ's religion at the beginning remembered by those interpreters.



analysing. We speak now of the adoption by Constantine of the Christian religion. We live in an age which has done and is doing wonders in the way of setting history right; grubbing in the graves of dead things, we are daily drawing 'conclusions,' if not 'most forbidden,' at least most astonishing. We can speak now, without any remorse of voice or pen, of the saint-hood of Cromwell, the lofty conceptions of Robespierre, the patriotism of Catiline, the gentle epicureanism of the calumniated Nero. If ever history will recover among us her long-lost dignity, and awaken to the consciousness of her high calling; if she will ever again, abandoning sensationalism, regain amongst us her passionless grandeur, and eschew at once the tricks of the conjuror and the meannesses of the partisan, we shall see justice done to the memory of Constantine. Archdeacon Lee, in small space, has done much towards the right guidance of our generation on this topic (pp. 40—44). Happily for us, we are not called upon to discuss the life so strange, so sad, so inexplicable, of one who named Christ, yet cherished all the sanctions of paganism, and was deified at his death. We have only to deal with two facts, one of which at all events will not be questioned at this day, and this fact is, that in neither its scientific nor its popular sense had conversion overtaken Constantine till he was stretched upon his death-bed. The other fact is this: beyond any doubt Constantine extended to his Christian subjects a great many privileges. By the Edict of Milan, A.D. 313, he as it were repealed all Corporation and Test Acts, and admitted apparently the Christian sect to the privileges of the constitution. The faith of Christ was besides, in a secular way, fostered by the Emperor, who was wrought upon either by his secret superstitions or his political convictions. If, then, in this patronage of the Emperor we are to discover the conversion of the Empire—and this is our last resort—was it so accounted of by the Catholic Church; by those who were the best judges of the whole position; who had the greatest interest in, and who might be tempted to form the most sanguine expectations from, this supposed triumph of the Cross? Mr. Merivale himself tells us (p. 162) that to the last the Christians expected no conversion of Cæsar to Christ; the heathen were not more perplexed than the Christians. 'The Church was taken by surprise, it was put out in its calculations—confused in its prospects—baffled, I believe, in some of its dearest and most spiritual anticipations. This event threw back the near-expected millennium into the illimitable future.' In what sense are we to call that a *conversion*, of which the preacher himself says that it 'proved no un-mixed good to the faith of Christ; and that there were many good Christians who regarded it with pious apprehension'?

But—we quote the words of one whom we listen to, on every subject but this, with admiring and reverential attention<sup>1</sup>—*‘The earth helped the woman, and swallowed up the stream; ‘that is, the Roman Empire became Christian, and the Church ‘was rescued and protected by the civil power, and therefore’* [is it that such divine grace lodges in the civil power?] *‘the devil departed to devise some other mode of attack upon the Church.’*

For confirmation of this portentous comment—a comment which does the utmost violence to the symbolism by identifying, in effect, the *earth* and *woman*—we are referred to the notes. What find we there? That Constantine in a letter speaks, as a disciple of Confucius might, of the ejection of the dragon from the government of the world. And we are further told that the Emperor set up a statue in his palace representing this. He gave toleration to Christians, discarded pagan and adopted Christian symbols, and decreed the observance of the Lord’s Day!<sup>2</sup> This is for an empire and an emperor *to become Christian*. When we read how, after ten years of atheism, amid the murmurs of the army, and in the presence of an infidel court, Napoleon re-established the Catholic faith in France, the divine words above recited seem tolerably applicable. But with the exception of the mention of the *Cross* and the Lord’s Day (and about the former there is a doubt), we read nothing more distinctively Christian on the part of Constantine than might be predicated of some Thibetian doctor, or Mohammedan purist.

We may listen to the words of one whose religious prejudices might have led him to form the most favourable and exalted notions of the conversion of the Empire, as understood by Mr. Merivale.

---

<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth, *On the Apocalypse*, pp. 202, 203. We call attention with pleasure to the following sound words on the same text (Rev. xii. 16).

*‘The worldly power of persecution is swallowed up by another power, itself also of the earth. Just as in past ages the kingdom of Babylon, the great persecutor of the Church of Israel, was overthrown by the kingdom of Persia, which took under its protection the exiled remnant, and restored it to its land and to its temple; even thus should it be with the empire of pagan Rome; it also should be humbled and partitioned by a new power, barbarian and godless in its beginning, but destined in due time to embrace, in name at least, the faith once abhorred, and to introduce that new order of things which should make a nominal Christianity the religion of states and nations, and secure it for ever against the risk of bygone persecutions. The prophecy is not that which, however improbable it might have appeared, was at least obvious to an inventor, namely, that the faith of Christ then so much despised should one day be adopted by the Roman Empire; but rather that persecuting Rome itself should be absorbed and engulfed in another kingdom, or group of kingdoms, which should help the Church without ceasing to be worldly, and put down the Church’s enemies, without really incorporating itself into the Church.’—*Lect. on Revelation of St. John*, by Dr. Vaughan. Vol. ii. pp. 54, 55.*

<sup>2</sup> In proof of the misconception contained in this statement, see Lee’s *Introductory Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, p. 42.

'The revolution accomplished by Constantine, indeed, might have become a real, and by far the most comprehensive regeneration of the Roman State, as it substituted for its originally defective and now completely rotten foundation of paganism, a new principle of life, a higher and more potent energy of divine truth and eternal justice. But Christianity had not yet near become the universal religion of the people and empire of Rome,—otherwise the great reaction, which took place under Julian, had not been possible. The peasantry, in particular, continued for a long time yet attached to the old idolatry; and hence the name of pagans was derived. Even Constantine, though he publicly declared himself a convert to Christianity, still did not dare to receive baptism immediately, and thus enter fully into the great community of Christians. The administration of the Roman State was so completely interwoven with pagan rites and pagan doctrines, that from an act of this public nature collisions might have at first easily ensued. On the whole, the old Roman maxims and principles of state policy continued to prevail, even for a long time after the reign of Constantine; and the period had not yet arrived when Christianity was to work a fundamental reform throughout the whole political world,—and a Christian government, if I may so speak, was to be established and organized on that eternal basis, and to strike deep root and grow into the faith of the people, and into their habits and feelings; but this great revolution was reserved for another and later period.'—*Schlegel's Phil. of History*, pp. 295, 296, Bohn.

We plead then against the form 'conversion of the Roman Empire,' not more because it is logically, than because it is historically untrue. We protest against the majesty and force of the triumphs of the Church being impaired by her being represented as sharing the throne and guiding the counsels of Cæsar; and we might further urge, that the conversion of an empire covering four-fifths of the civilized earth militates against the fundamental idea of the constitution, mission, and destiny of the Church, and is at once the source and justification of Papalism. In fact, for the earliest proper conversion of this kind, if we are to look anywhere, we must look, with Schlegel, to the evangelization of the German nations. As soon as the 'natural moral energy of the Germanic nations had received a religious consecration from Christianity, and those energetic, heroic souls had imbibed with fervour, simplicity and humility, the maxims of the religion of love; all the elements of a truly Christian government and Christian system of policy were then offered to mankind.' (Schl. p. 348.) There is indeed one instance of a national and governmental conversion to Christianity earlier than the reputed one under Constantine, in the case of Tiridates, probably the first king, and his country, Armenia, certainly the first nation, as a nation, to embrace the religion of the Cross. Under Theodosius, sixty years after Constantine, we meet with the total extinction of paganism, when all the heathen 'temples of the Roman world were subverted;' and this appears to us the only event in all the centuries to which, with any show of justice, the title 'conversion of the Roman Empire' can be applied. Up to the date 384, so influential in Rome itself was the

pagan element, that 424 temples and chapels remained to satisfy the devotion of the people; everywhere the Christians had to meet and suffer the fumes of idolatrous sacrifices from the altars which Constantine had restored; and four deputations were sent to the Emperor, headed by the illustrious and eloquent Symmachus, at once pontiff, augur, prefect of the city, and proconsul of Africa, to implore the restoration of the altar of Victory. The gifted Roman in his oration introduced Rome herself as pleading, that 'since I do not repent, let me continue 'in the practice of my ancient rites.' But the advocate of Olympus, unconvinced, was sent into exile, and Theodosius propounded the question to the Senate, whether the worship of Jupiter, or that of Christ, should be the religion of the Romans.<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding the sanctity and eloquence of Ambrose (the Pope is nowhere at this very critical moment), and the controlling presence of the Emperor himself, one half of the Senate was found to divide in favour of the abdicated deity. We are not told how these senators were induced to join the Christian half of their body; they seem to have conformed, however, very cheerfully and unanimously. Rome was become Christian now at last, and the name of Rome was still powerful throughout the provinces. If a doubt yet remains on the point, it is justified by the poet Prudentius himself, who, glorying in the Christianization of the Catos and Gracchi, exclaims—

Et dubitamus adhuc Romam tibi, Christe, dicatam,  
Tu leges transisse tuas? omnique volentem  
Cum populo et summis cum civibus ardua magni  
Jam super astra poli terrenum extendere regnum?<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps at this time, but certainly at no earlier, could we venture to say 'that the conversion of the *Empire* was substantially completed.' (Pref. p. xiii.)

That progress of the Gospel, then, in the first four centuries, which in deference to the usage of our time we are to call the 'Conversion of the Roman Empire,' was furthered and secured, under God's providence, by evidences, prophetic and miraculous, to the truth of Christianity; by the sense widely diffused

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lee discredits this narrative, which has been accepted by Gibbon, Gieseler, and Neander. The silence of S. Ambrose and S. Jerome seems intelligible enough.

<sup>2</sup> Let the reader bear in mind that it was partly in despair of Rome's ever being Christianized that Constantine was led to found the Metropolis that bears his name.

<sup>3</sup> Prudent. in Symmach. lib. i. 588—592. See also Gibbon, chap. xxviii. sub init. Mr. Merivale, however, is of opinion (Pref. p. xiii.) that 'the conversion of the more intelligent' not only preceded the conversion of Constantine, but had 'been effected before the proved inefficacy of the heathen religions had caused them to be abandoned by the herd of time-servers.'

through heathendom, of spiritual destitution;<sup>1</sup> and by the holy examples, in life and death, of the primitive Christians. The Christian profession of the supreme ruler or Emperor must have contributed considerably to the diffusion of the Gospel; but the consideration of this branch of the subject necessarily lies beyond our author's limits. Under the first of the three heads just specified we are to bear in mind that heathendom itself contributed to the completeness of the demonstration. However we may ourselves be disposed to estimate the authenticity and genuineness of the Sibylline verses, heathendom in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era received them as veritable productions; fathers of the Church, in controversy, made most successful use of them, and fortified their arguments with the supposed oracles of a pagan age.

Dolus an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?

Passing from this *external* evidence to that which is properly speaking *internal*, evidence from the acknowledged need of a Sanctifier and Redeemer; this effectual testimony to the truth in Christ Jesus is necessarily of a comparatively limited range. The cultivated intellects of heathendom of the Pentecostal era, bear ample testimony to the consciousness so widely spread of the moral exhaustion of society. From the nature of the case, such a preparation for the reception of the Gospel could only be found among the educated, the exalted, and the learned. Hence arises the conclusion which runs so counter to prevailing notions on the subject that the Gospel was in fact, from the very first, brought before those who constituted in our phrase '*the upper classes*' (p. 83). The elder dispensation, by its election of a nation seemed to recognise what was the main and fundamental idea of the heathen philosophic schools, that there was an '*aristocracy of souls*.' But when the mission of Christ was granted to the Gentiles all the barriers of caste were annihilated. Accordingly, neither were especial privileges extended to the poor, nor, on the other hand, were the rich passed over or excluded. The social rank of the Apostle, the associations into which his rights, as a Roman citizen, gave him free admission, the conclusions actually forced upon us as well by the monuments of antiquity as by the indications furnished by the Apostle's writings, demonstrate that the ranks of the Church were largely recruited from the ranks of the more eminent citizens. Our author seems to affirm too much, however, when he denies that the first preaching of the Gospel was addressed

<sup>1</sup> We were struck more than once by the sympathy between Mr. Merivale (pp. 91—93) and M. de Broglie, '*L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au Quatrième Siècle*,' tom. i. pp. 182, 183.

to the poor and the outcast, the 'meanest and least intelligent,' 'the proletaries of society.' In point of fact, the Gospel was addressed impartially to both ranks of society, else who were the slaves evangelized by the Apostle? Who could have been the brethren 'of low degree'? While we reject the unspiritual fancy of the *religious* world, we must be on our guard against embracing a kindred, albeit opposite, extravagance. The aristocracy of Rome itself, as we have seen, were to the last 'obstinate adherents of Paganism.' And further:—

'The proofs which evinced that Christ's religion was divine was not merely his acts of supernatural power, but a fact which to his hearers was no less astonishing: "The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, TO THE POOR THE GOSPEL IS PREACHED." I do not know whether the collocation of proofs has ever struck you with surprise; the "preaching of the Gospel to the poor" is added to the last and greatest of testimonies, the raising from the dead: leavened as modern society has been by the influence of Christianity, it may appear somewhat superfluous even to particularize as a characteristic of any form of religion that the poor should partake of its consolations. A brief survey of the state of society at the date of the birth of Christ will exhibit how great a moral miracle was here performed.'—Archdeacon Lee, pp. 18, 19.

State religions were waxing old, and seemed ready to vanish away. But the victory of the Cross was not to be acquired without a struggle. The grand and enduring forms of philosophic paganism were prepared to die rather than to surrender or to cast themselves into new combinations, and to borrow the theosophy of the East in order to obstruct or undermine the theology of the Cross. The consideration of this part of our subject we shall resume further on.

Fourteen years have passed away since we last mentioned in these pages the author of the work which stands second on our list. Mr. Allies was then before us as the writer of an essay which *asserted* that all that was true which the same author in a work published two years previously had *proved* to be false. It must be confessed, that at the date of the later brochure he was only a 'convert of a few months' standing.' He had just accomplished the ultra-puritan feat of Sir Hudibras, who could on either side,

'dispute  
Confute, change hands, and still confute.'

But his power in logic was not equal to his skill in rhetoric.

'For Rhetoric he could not ope  
His mouth but out there flew a trope.'

Fourteen years' silence and meditation have not amended in our author this over-copiousness of rhetoric. He is often brilliant



and attractive, and almost always fluent and correct. But his ideas suffer from the unchastened redundancy of his verbiage; and like that eminent Englishwoman, Mrs. Gamp's babies—they are often 'turned up smiling unbeknownst' in the oppressive luxuriance of his tameless volubility. The writer of the paper in this Review which we have just referred to, had described Mr. Allies' lucubrations as marked by 'broad religious caricature' and 'strong religious sentiment;' in a word, the ingredients that go to the composition of a sermon *à la* Spurgeon. In the present work he is as voluble as ever; as copious and as sketchy. It may be the effect produced on us by his former publications, but the impression which the present work has left on us is calculated to confirm rather than to modify the verdict pronounced in this Review in 1851. Dismissing, however, a line of criticism which may be pronounced somewhat premature, inasmuch as the whole work is not before us, we may remark on the felicitous designation of the volume, which to our judgment might have been fixed upon with advantage by Mr. Merivale as the title of his lectures. 'The Formation of Christendom' is as happily indefinite in all its import as the theme. But the execution is marred by much that is puerile and frivolous; and the author fairly revels, or seems to revel, in the loud and complacent avowal of the most amusing paradoxes. Thus one of the formative processes of Christendom was the creation of the virginal life.<sup>1</sup> Lecture VI. on this topic alone has the honour of a motto; and it has two of these, the latter of which is forced by

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Allies quotes S. Austin, De S. Virgin, 4, commenting on S. Luke i. 34. 'Quomodo fiet istud quoniam virum non cognosco? Quod profecto non diceret nisi Deo virginem se ante vovisset.' How this latter vow may be reconciled with the vow of her espousals, is explained by our Bishop Taylor (Life of Christ, Part I. Sect. i. § 5). 'She was a person of a rare sanctity, and so mortified a spirit, that for all the dispensation of her, according to the desire of her parents and the custom of the nation, she had not set one step toward the consummation of her marriage, so much as in thought, and possibly had set herself back from it by a vow [by the nature of the case necessarily conditional] of chastity and holy celibate.' But Mr. Allies, p. 231, is venturesome enough to declare that the B. V. 'scrupled to accept the offer of a dignity before which the crowns of earth sunk into nothing, until it was revealed unto her that her virgin estate was compatible with that dignity!' We shall not characterize this statement as it deserves. We shall content ourselves with quoting the comment of S. Bernard. 'Primo quidem prudenter tacuit cum adhuc dubia cogitabat qualis esset salutatio, malens, nimirum humiliter non respondere quam temere loqui, quod nesciret. Jam vero confortata et bene premeditata, angelo quidem foris loquente, sed Deo intus persuadente (erat enim Dominus cum illa, dicente Angelo (*Dominus tecum*), ita ergo confirmata, fide scilicet depellente timorem, lætitia verecundiam, dixit ad Angelum: Quomodo, &c. Non dubitat de facto, sed modum requirit et ordinem, nec enim querit an fiet istud sed quomodo.' S. Bernard, Opp. tom. ii. p. 80. It is curious that those who have no scruple about the deification of the Blessed Virgin Mary should have no scruple in imputing to her a sceptical distrust so unworthy of a devout daughter of Abraham.

its position to imply a sanction of the grotesque extravagance which fills the following pages. But let us be accurate. Do we mean by Virginity, *chastity*? If so, we have no room for censure of the author. *Causa finita est.* In the practice of religion there is not one feature which so wholly distinguishes Christianity from Paganism as the tenet of the former touching the singular mystery and supernatural character of chastity: chastity, of course, we mean of body and soul, which has a 'hidden strength'—

'Which, if heaven gave it, may be termed her own;  
She that has that, is clad in complete steel.'

The virginal or continent life—Mr. Allies varies the phrase, in seeming obliviousness of the fact that he is at the same time varying to some extent the idea—is the gift of God. Rightly regarded as such it involves no painful sacrifice on the part of him who feels himself called to it. It is attended with fewer trials, and it is accompanied with some greater blessings than fall to the married state. In praise of the virginal life, 'all the ancient Christian writers' have spoken, proclaiming that it is 'the condition of all perfect following of our Lord.' In proof of this statement our author proceeds to say, 'Thus the Apostle,' and he quotes 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4, and Apocalypse xiv. 4, not a large induction of texts; of which two it may be said that the latter has only a distant, while the former has no connexion whatever with the matter in hand. When Mr. Allies comes down from his transcendental elevation, and delineates the advantages of what he would call the religious life, he can write to the point and command our assent. Nor do we mean to dispute in the least the effect on heathendom of this and other kinds of Christian self-denial. But when he asserts that the Christian faith alone in the history of mankind has asked for this sacrifice, and alone has received it—the sacrifice, that is, of marriage; when he adds, that the preliminary condition of it is that solemn profession of the life of continence which is exhibited in the clergy and religious orders (p. 370), we must remind him of the fact, which seems to have escaped him till he could only find room for it in a note (p. 335) that the Vestal virgins formed a caste of self-dedicated religious, who entered on their noviciate before they were ten years of age; that a special reverence waited on, as a peculiar sanctity was believed to hedge round, these nuns of heathen Rome; that all pagan modes of religion, especially the Oriental faiths, had or have their religious orders; that, however faintly and falsely, the ancient systems adopted or preserved this form of godliness; and if the institution was unfruitful it was because the power

from above was withheld. According to the fair humanities of the old religions, heathendom itself was not insensible to the qualities of virginity.

Do ye believe me yet, or shall I call  
Antiquity from the old schools of Greece  
To testify the arms of Chastity?  
Hence had the huntress Dian her dread bow,  
Fair silver-shafted queen, for ever chaste.

By whom, Mr. Allies asks us, was the Christian faith first spread over the Roman Empire? (p. 368.) We had thought that not least, if not most prominently, by a certain Prince of a company of Apostles, who was guilty, we fear, in our author's judgment, for leading about with him 'a wife a sister.' He tells us, indeed (p. 382), that there are nations 'which *might seem*, from the large portions of Christian doctrine which they 'still hold, to be nearer to Christianity than the Hindoo or the 'Chinese;' and we fear, being conscience-stricken, that we, Anglican Atheists, are the semi-Orientalists he has in his eye; we think we see him shaking his head at us as he thus upbraids us for our supposed contempt for continency and dislike for a virginal life. Yet, when we observe that Rome has so lately raised to that episcopal order which that same Rome by her decrees has denuded of all Apostolic virtue, our respected compatriot after the flesh, Dr. Manning, who labours under the irreparable disadvantages of widowhood, we may surely retort that such an arrangement is calculated to confirm rather than to dispel our impious prejudices. Mr. Allies broadly states, indeed, in his text (p. 349) that, 'before our Lord's Incarnation no race on earth, 'whatever its natural gifts, had produced such a phenomenon as 'the virginal life.' This startling statement is modified in a note. The writer remembers the Essenes, of whom he tells us that they 'did not continue nor propagate themselves.' We do not know how such an assertion can be true of a body of mystic ascetics who succeeded in achieving an historical position and maintaining it for 200 years; a gate of the Temple was called after them. They took as much pains as the ascetics of the Thebaid to propagate themselves; and, like them, slowly disappeared.' But there is another modification of the text. Our author bethinks him of certain Old Testament types of the virginal life. He mentions Elias; but he seems to forget that, according to the authorities of his own Church, that divine monk was founder of the confraternity of the ascetics of Mount Carmel. Of this historical fact Mr. Allies is, or ought to be, better informed than we are. And it is a fact, which reve-

<sup>1</sup> To speak more accurately they probably merged into the Osseni. Epiphani. Hæres. xix.

rence for what has been described as the most gracious institution in his present communion should have constrained him not to discredit.<sup>1</sup> Thus, with all respect for Mr. Allies, we have something more than types in the Old Testament of the virginal life. Celibacy in its strictest form was an institution of the old dispensation, and the Nazarite system was prior in point of time to the giving of the Law. The Nazarite was dead to the world, and wholly dedicated to God. The order was not limited to males, as we gather from Numbers vi. 2, in which passage if a limited time is spoken of, this is obviously because under the Law the duration of the vow was limited, as far as we know, save in cases like those of Samuel and S. John the Baptist. It is beyond all dispute that in the Old Testament we have an order of religious women, self-dedicated to the Lord, to minister to him night and day, while in the New Testament we can hardly doubt that in 1 Cor. vii. 25, we have a relaxation of the severity of the original institution, Lev. xxvii. 4.<sup>2</sup> It is on this footing that the more general re-establishment among ourselves of religious houses has been urged. It serves a purpose, with writers like Mr. Allies, to describe the system of the Religious Life as the invention of the Church. We advocate it upon what always must be with us the incomparable argument, the certain warrant of Holy Writ. We affirm that it is not a question of private benevolence or voluntary arrangement, nor yet only a result of the immediate exigencies of the Church. It is a question which resolves itself into this—Are we or are we not to obey the Word of God? Are we to abandon a system sanctified for all Christian time by the example of the

<sup>1</sup> As the founder of the Devotions of the Scapular was an Englishman, S. Simon Stock, of Kent, Mr. Allies ought to have remembered him. He was, we are told, Superior General of Mount Carmel, and received from the Blessed Virgin Mary the Scapular, formed of two pieces of cloth so joined together that one hangs over the breast, the other over the shoulders. The Blessed Virgin promised S. Simon Stock that whosoever died wearing this ornament should escape eternal fire. No special prayer or fast is prescribed. By wearing her own habit the brethren of the order of Mount Carmel enjoy peculiar blessings from the Mother of our Lord. Among these are, early release from purgatory. In his bull, dated March 3, 1322, Pope John XXII. puts on record his vision of the Blessed Virgin Mary, her words, her promise, and ratifies the whole by his infallible authority; "Die quo ab hoc sæculo isti recedunt,—*"Ego mater gloriosa descendam sabbato post eorum obitum, et quos invenero in purgatorio liberabo et eos in montem sanctum vitæ æternæ reducam."* Istam ergo sanctam indulgentiam accipio, roboro et, in terris confirmo, sicut propter merita virginis matris gloriosæ Jesus Christus concessit in cœlis."—See Devotion to our Lady of Mount Carmel; or, a Short Treatise on the Institution and Advantages of the Confraternity of the ancient Scapular of our Lady of Mount Carmel. Revised and approved by a Prelate of the Order. Published by Richardson and Son: London and Derby.

<sup>2</sup> In his note on the verse 1 Cor. vii. 28, Esthius, to destroy the relaxation, quietly interpolates at 'she hath not sinned,' *nisi sit virgo Christo dicata.*

devout Anna, and re-inaugurated for the new dispensation by the example of S. John the Baptist? Of the monasticism of the Prophet order in Israel we say nothing here. It might be urged that the state of things in the revolted kingdom was wholly exceptional and irregular. Our attention is fixed exclusively on the Theocratic system. There we find that to the ministering women the tabernacle was indebted for the laver, the font of Israel. (Exod. xxxviii. 8). The word which our authorized version renders *assembling* is of *military* import, and implies a formally organized institution<sup>1</sup> which was of a strictly ascetic character, as the dedication of the mirrors implies.<sup>2</sup> It is in the light of this fact we can understand the statements of the Apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 34, and the words of the Redeemer Himself, with their retrospective significance, S. Matth. xix. 12. Unlike similar organizations in idolatrous countries, Egypt alone excepted, the Jewish nuns were not priestesses, nor yet were they bound to any menial or external service. With them it was wholly spiritual; they were derived from the highest ranks, and were always unmarried, either maidens or widows. But we have gone far enough to demonstrate that the note with which Mr. Allies modifies the large statement in his text is wholly insufficient; that in claiming for what he calls the virginal life an exclusive origination in and peculiar sanction from the Virgin Birth of the Redeemer, he disregards the types which foreshowed that perpetual virginity through which Christ was born; and he betrays a surprising ignorance not only of the primitive institutions of Scripture, but of what will probably seem of more concern to him, one of the most remarkable discoveries of the Church of Rome.

With an equally rapid and inaccurate pen, Mr. Allies discusses the question of Christian marriage as one of the formative processes of Christendom. Lecture V. is devoted to the review of 'the new creation of the primary relation between man and woman;' in other words, we presume, the re-establishment of the sanctity and mystery of wedlock. He admits in the case of marriage what he denies in the case of continency, or the virginal life. He admits that in the heathen nations, the further back we trace them, the more we discover a recognition of the sanctity of marriage; but he assures the *alumni* of the Catholic University of Ireland for whom he lectures, and who, we fear, would not otherwise have had an opportunity of learning the fact, that the 'wisest men of Greece, Rome, Persia, India, Egypt, China, and if there be any other nations of the

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg, On Pentateuch, vol. ii. pp. 63, 110.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Peter iii. 3, 4. The dedicated women who had remained unredeemed (Lev. xxvii. 4) were reckoned among the religious order of the Sanctuary.

'world which could compete with these,' never produced anything 'worthy to be compared with the teaching which the 'great Hebrew Prophet [*i.e.* Moses] has here [*i.e.* Gen. ii. 19, 20] 'summed up in a dozen lines.' However it might be elsewhere, the sanctity of marriage was long cherished at heathen Rome. Whether the tradition be historically true or not, it bears witness distinctly to this fact—the tradition, we mean, that for 500 years there had been no divorce at Rome. We are more concerned with the Roman usage, because the Roman institutions formed the *τύπος* into which the ore of the divine truth was delivered. But the inevitable corruption set in at last. The efforts of Augustus to enforce public morality were ineffectual, and the courtier-poet's prediction of the *progenies vitiosior* was too surely fulfilled. With the descent of the Holy Ghost a new era began; when the divine idea of marriage hitherto entrusted to, misunderstood and abused by, the Jews, was given to the world. By the heavenly purifying of this very fountain-head of society, the most blessed assurance was given of the ultimate establishment of Christianity. 'The grafting the natural properties of marriage upon a divine sacrament,' or as we would prefer to read it, 'the grafting of a divine sacrament upon the 'natural properties of marriage, could only be carried out by the 'Church' (p. 305). Plainly so. No one else knew anything whatever about it. It was her mission to proclaim, among other things, the mystery, sanctity, indissolubility of Christian wedlock. That testimony was borne amid all the troubles attending the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and as a proof of the fidelity of the Church—the Church of Rome that is—to her mission, 'she preferred to suffer a powerful kingdom and a 'still more powerful race, destined to dominion, to break from 'their obedience rather than' that Henry VIII. should be allowed to divorce Catherine. And that we may not suppose the sleepless care of the Supreme Pontiff to have failed, we are reminded that the Pope refused to dissolve the *legitimate marriage* of Prince Jerome Buonaparte and Miss Paterson (p. 311). Upon the general question of Rome's fidelity to her office as a witness to the mystery of Christian marriage, and whether she does really regard, or can consistently with her principles regard, as legitimate a marriage between a heretic and a Catholic, there will be differences of opinion perhaps. But certainly a large body of evidence is forthcoming to prove that she has exercised very largely a dispensing power; that she exercised that dispensing power in a remarkable way in the case of this very marriage of the Tudor. Julius II. by dispensation enabled Henry to marry his brother's widow; Clement VII. by bull (unpublished, but bearing date Dec. 16, 1527), permitted Henry to



divorce his wife. Two Primates of England, and a Cardinal promoted that divorce; all the Bishops of England—still in the Roman obedience—promoted that divorce; all the Universities of rank in Europe promoted that divorce; and the Catholic States of Europe subsequently objected the illegitimacy of Mary. It is just as true that a regard to the sanctity of marriage withheld Clement from publishing the dispensation that he had already uttered, as it is true that the massacre of S. Bartholomew was perpetrated by the Huguenots, and was the result of Protestant principles; that the she-Pope Elizabeth had her eight husbands and her bastards; that the Dominican assassin Clement was a Huguenot and a crypto-Calvinist; and even Alexander VI., though not a Protestant, yet one who may well be regarded as an instrument of Providence.<sup>1</sup> It furnishes a curious comment on the Pontifical zeal for the sanctity of marriage, and a strange evidence how fully that zeal had leavened the European nations of the Roman obedience that Roman Catholic powers should have promoted, that all the dignitaries of the Roman Communion should have sanctioned by their presence, that the Ecclesiastical Court of Paris should have formally ratified, and that a cardinal should have blessed the so-called marriage of Napoleon and Maria Louisa, a union which the Russian schismatics had divine light enough to regard with disgust. So far for powers such as those of England being alone 'unable to sustain the idea and practice of Christian marriage,' and so much for the Roman Church being alone able to uphold the 'nuptial bond' (p. 314); so much for the earnestness of the Pontiff to protect the feeble—such as Josephine, and to vindicate, by the representatives of his office, and the members of his communion, the mystery of marriage.

On the two subjects which we have now discussed, Mr. Allies writes, of course, as a fully assured Roman Catholic. Perhaps he exhibits too much assurance; but with this, of course, we have nothing to do. The facts of history, however, are the inheritance of us all. Upon these facts men will reason. We are not aware that Mr. Allies is gifted with any infallibility which will enable him to rectify the inexorable logic of those facts. In the instances we have been examining he, of course unconsciously, perverts and misapplies history. He is sanguine that we shall at last achieve a Catholic history. Catholic science we have already. Catholic hydrostatics,

<sup>1</sup> We here avail ourselves of an article on Ultramontanism in the *Home and Foreign Review*. An article which probably accounts for the fact, which is so sad, that that able review is a thing of the past. Could Mr. Allies have entered into the feeling of the paper we refer to, it is not perhaps too much to say that he would have omitted much of the present work.

Catholic theorems, are no doubt harmless things enough; but Catholic history, after the manner of Rohrbacher, will no doubt hasten on the fall of the hideous fortress of self-will with its proud and stubborn defenders (p. 39). Here again we fear we occupy the mind's eye of our author. 'May we not hope that 'this also is a glory reserved for those who have in the midst of 'them one who sits in Peter's chair, at the centre of the earth, 'alone immovable where all is fluctuating; who may well possess and communicate to his children the Secret of History, for 'he has seen age after age and people after people pass by him? 'they are gone and he remains the same, to be to all future 'generations what he was to them—Truth's Pillar, or its witness. 'Sedet æternumque sedebit' (p. 36). *Infelix Theseus* completes the quotation. If it be indeed true, as Mr. Allies implies, that the Pope, now but a 'crownless metaphor of empire,' really possesses the Secret of History, and as we may not dare to hope for it from (p. 12) S. Thomas [we suppose Aquinas], Theseus may become happy at once. He owns a treasure worth very many thousands, and he is said to be not very affluent. Let him publish. The community of publishers are notoriously generous. He will make their fortunes and his own. They will be grateful.

Mr. Merivale views his subject rather from the pagan side. He is more engaged in examining the obstructions presented by heathenism to the progress of the Gospel, than the resources of the Gospel itself. Mr. Allies, on the other hand, dwells almost exclusively on the latter theme. He attributes—and in so doing is entitled to our fullest assent—the reconstruction of society to the revelation of the dual mystery of God and of humanity; the consequent imitation of Christ, and what this involves, the historical representation of Him, in the strict sense of the word representation, before the unregenerate world; and the perpetual testimony borne to His mission by the unity, uniformity, and universality of the Church. But before we proceed to discuss more closely the whole subject, we must not leave unnoticed the sketch of it which has been supplied to us by another *alumnus* of Oxford; one who, like Mr. Allies, renounced his allegiance to the Catholic Church in England to join the Roman system, but whom the Roman religion could not bind; who, the pupil of Middleton, Parsons, and Bossuet, accepted what he calls the 'prodigy of transubstantiation,' only to abandon it for infidelity. In the memorable fifteenth chapter of the 'Decline and Fall,' Gibbon discusses the rise and progress of the Faith. He recognises the existence of primary causes, and with that 'grave and temperate irony' which he may have caught from Pascal, he passes in review 'the secondary causes of the

rapid growth of the Christian Church.' For adopting this latter course, a very great deal of very violent censure has been heaped upon the author, almost as violent as if he had formally denied the existence of any other than secondary causes. Now it is obvious that no other course was open to Gibbon. To have expatiated on the first causes—supposing him to have had faith to entertain them—would have marred and changed the whole character of his history. And, apart from the fact, that the admission of what he designates secondary implies a recognition in some sense of the existence of primary causes, two such works as those before us, produced by two independent thinkers who each profess to glory in the Cross, and who each discuss the secondary causes only, constitute the amplest vindication possible of the line pursued by Gibbon. Mr. Allies' copiosity betrays him into a contrast between Tacitus and Gibbon. A more ambitious literary effort, and a more sustained one, is the comparison between Cicero and S. Augustine, in which he does scant justice to the great Roman, and leaves out of sight the fact that the saint ascribes in his Confessions the first step in his conversion to the study of the Hortensius (Lib. iii. c. 4). But to return to the contrast between Tacitus and Gibbon:—

'How far wider a grasp of thought, how far more manifold an experience combined with a philosophic purpose in Gibbon than in Tacitus! He has a standard within him by which he can measure the nations as they come in long procession before him. How much larger is this world become than that which trembled at Cæsar! The very apostate profits by the light which has shone on Thabor, and the blood which has flowed on Calvary. He is a greater historian than his heathen predecessor, because he lives, "in a word, [in Christendom."']—P. 15.

Man's thoughts *widen*, the Poet Laureate tells us—and he must know—with 'the processes of the sun.' Unfortunately they do not *deepen*. A bigger world, and a bigger book to fit it, do not imply a world struggling with higher instincts, and a work permeated by a more philosophic spirit. The Consul of the Empire, and the Recluse of Geneva; the sensitive, the eloquent, the far-sighted statesman, and the selfish, bookish, blinded rhetorician; the writer who, though a pagan, upheld with unflinching loyalty the imperishable dignity of virtue and truth, nor knew at how many points he shared the witness of that Gospel which never reached him; and the industrious apostate, throwing down the Cross he had professed, and by so doing incapacitating himself for every high and genuine view of nature and of truth, and demonstrating this by the one labour of his life, at once impious in design and impure in execution. In drawing the contrast to the disparagement of the heathen, Mr. Allies seems to have forgotten his Tacitus, and to have lost

at the same time his faculty of moral judgment.<sup>1</sup> But how great was the darkness in the historian! Perhaps no one work of the same size and pretensions exhibits more remarkably the divorce between philosophy and history, or makes us feel more keenly the diversity of gifts which makes one an assiduous and successful drill-serjeant, and instils into another the sublime instincts of command. Now Gibbon is not a commander. There is not a grain of philosophy in Gibbon. He is incomparable in his own, but that is not a dignified, however an important, department of history. The whole government of the British Empire was once obstructed, according to Burke, by a kitchen functionary of the palace. In the same way we are all beholden to Mr. Gibbon. But for all that constitutes the philosophy of history, 'the relation of events to each other, their mutual connexion, their causes and effects' (Lee, p. 13), there is little, if anything, to be found in the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.' Let Porson tell us what there is to be found.

'Mr. Gibbon's industry is indefatigable; his accuracy scrupulous; his reading, which is sometimes ostentatiously displayed, immense; his attention always awake; his memory retentive, his style emphatic and expressive; his sentences harmonious; his reflections are just and profound; nor does his humanity ever slumber unless when women are ravished or the Christians persecuted. He often makes, when he cannot find, an occasion to insult our religion, which he hates so cordially that he might seem to revenge some personal injury. Such is his eagerness in the cause that he stoops to the most despicable pun, and the most awkward perversion of language, for the pleasure of turning the Scripture into ribaldry, or of calling Jesus an impostor. Though his style is in general correct and elegant, he sometimes draws out "the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument." In endeavouring to avoid vulgar terms he too frequently dignifies trifles, and clothes common thoughts in a splendid dress that would be rich enough for the noblest ideas. In short, we are too often reminded of that great man, Mr. Prig, the auctioneer, whose manner was so inimitably fine that he had as much to say upon a ribbon as a Raphael. A less pardonable fault is that rage for indecency which pervades the whole work, but especially the last volume. If the history were anonymous, I should guess that those disgraceful obscenities were written by some debauchee who from age, or accident, or excess had survived the practices of lust, &c.'

---

<sup>1</sup> The sixteenth chapter lies outside our brief. But perhaps the mode in which Gibbon sketches the martyrdom of S. Cyprian more fully illustrates than any other instance the insidious character of his hatred to Christianity. It is easy to be conceived how a philosophic historian would have dealt with this solemn and affecting event. Gibbon uses all the little arts of rhetoric to divert attention from the hero of the scene. He is careful to adjust all the dramatic properties; to dwell upon the grim courtesies of the execution as mitigatory circumstances. The martyrdom of S. Cyprian was as atrocious an act of persecution as can be found in the annals of the suffering Church, and might well have awakened a feeling of humanity in the heart of the historian. But Gibbon could almost as little appreciate the fine manliness as he could relish the Christian beauty of the character of the great Prelate.

The four secondary causes of Gibbon are : The constitutional jealousy of the Israelitish people. The assertion and enhancement of the doctrine of the future life. The morality of the first Christians. The unity and uniformity of the Christian Church. Now it will be seen that, with the exception of the first cause, our two modern writers have followed much the same line of thought as Gibbon ; but it is not the least notable characteristic of the celebrated fifteenth chapter of the 'Decline and Fall,' that the writer so handles the several topics which from the *human* side explain the propagation of the Gospel, as to leave the impression on the reader that the terrene influences which are set forth, instead of promoting, should have destroyed the faith. It is hard to account for this : whether it is the result of the inadvertence generated by scorn and contempt, or of the super-subtle cunning of industrious unbelief. The love of the lie so infatuates him that his very first sentence contains a statement as to the religious harmony of the ancient world, at variance with the most common facts of history.<sup>1</sup> He speaks as if the syncretism of Elagabalus and Severus embodied, instead of flagrantly and offensively contradicted, all the old traditions and religious instincts of the Empire. Then he refuses to distinguish between Ebionites and Nazarenes, the latter of whom he pompously describes as fleeing from the ruins of Jerusalem. He represents the fanaticism of the Jews as perpetuated among the Christians, and though he acknowledges the *vain* science of the Gnostics, he covertly extols the latter as possessing more purity and humanity and a more enlightened reason than could be found in the ranks of the Church. 'They were the most polite, the most learned, and the most worthy of the 'Christian name,' as if they themselves really pretended to that designation. In describing the anxious diligence of the primitive believers 'to guard the chastity of the Gospel from the infectious breath of idolatry,' he draws a picture of the Christian absolutely ridiculous. He takes no notice of the injunctions of S. Paul to the Corinthians ; but he accepts Tertullian as his authority, who, when he wrote his '*De Spectaculis*' and '*De Corona*,' had already surrendered himself to the spiritual extravagances of Montanus, and of whom the historian in a subsequent page, judged out of his own mouth, declares that after he became a Montanist he aspersed the morals of the Church he had so zealously defended.

To the same effect he deals with the doctrine of the future life as though it was mainly represented by a belief in a millen-

<sup>1</sup> Not to mention the Laws of the Twelve Tables, see Pusey on Daniel, p. 444, and note 5, where the statements of Gibbon and the Clerical Annotator in Bohn's edition of 'Decline and Fall' are finally disposed of.

nium, and the approaching end of the world, and he does not fail to demonstrate that the one was as little to be believed as the other. The cunningly devised fable of a personal reign on earth of Christ, when of no further use, was laid aside, and the Apocalypse has only escaped the proscription of believers through an imposition practised on the Greek Church, through the politic forethought of the Tridentine divines, and through the advantage which Protestants derive from turning these mysterious prophecies against the Roman see!<sup>1</sup>

On the subject of miracles, these supernatural gifts must have conduced to the *comfort* of the primitive Christians, and 'very frequently' to the conversion of the infidel. The propagation of the Gospel was in some measure attributable to miracles; but the historian proves that there never were miracles, at least in post-apostolic times. For did not a noble Grecian *demand* a miracle of Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch? and why did the latter, so anxious for the conversion of his friend, decline this fair and reasonable challenge? That 'unresisting softness of temper so conspicuous among' those whom he had a page or two back described as animated by the most narrow and fanatical bigotry—that unresisting softness of nature disposed the first Christians to receive the wonders wrought about them and as then the miracles of the Evangelic history exceeded not the measure of their own experience, they were inspired with the most lively assurance of the mysteries of the faith. In other words, whatever effect miracles might have had among professors of the faith, they never contributed anything to the conversion of the infidel. Much the same may be said of the virtues of the primitive believers. They were virtuous; that is granted. His authority, Tertullian, has told Gibbon that few Christians suffered at the hands of the executioner except for their religion. They were virtuous, but that was because, like the first Romans, they were very frequently poor and ignorant. If, being neither poor nor ignorant, they renounced the gratification of the senses, they indemnified themselves by indulgence in spiritual pride. With his wonted sleight of hand, he represents the Church as guided by opinions which only existed among the Manicheans and the Gnostics, and these he styles the 'austere and pure morals' which propagated the faith.

Mr. Allies, at the close of his fourth lecture (pp. 248-66), has dwelt with his wonted luxuriance of language on the effect upon the world of the unity, uniformity, and universality of the Church. The seven attributes which he regards as an exhaustive enumeration of the notes of the Church, and which he

---

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon is not careful to harmonise his statement.



recounts, are: that the Church rests entirely on the authority of Christ; that it presents a coherent, unchangeable system of doctrine; that it involves a government of souls; and at the same time exacts from each member a Christlike self-sacrifice for the good of each or of the whole; its service was therefore one of suffering; the sacrifice was bound up with its teaching and all these attributes; and it was supported by the example of its members carrying out its doctrines into practice. Here is such an account of the phenomena as must be at once recognised as consistent with reason and the spirit of the Gospel. Gibbon, on the other hand, looks on the ecclesiastical system as a human development craftily accommodated to the times, so as to captivate the human fancy, and enlist on its side the ambitions of this mortal estate. Twice within a page or two he touches upon the *lofty* titles of bishop and metropolitan, and affirms that it was only the 'progress of ecclesiastical authority which brought to light the distinction between ministry and people.' Cyprian is always either a vehement declaimer, or an ambitious statesman; still he acknowledges the liberal alms-giving of the body, the care the Church exercised over those whom the world would have abandoned to the miseries of sickness and old age. And '*there is some reason to believe,*'—so he introduces one of the most marked and unquestionable of the blessings which the Church ministered to the world—that through the agency of the Gospel the crime of infanticide was checked. These meek and gentle virtues *won* upon the world. The excommunicatory powers of the Church commanded or enforced recognition. When he reads 'the imperious declamation' of Cyprian, he seems to be listening to Moses, when he 'commanded the earth to open, and swallow up in consuming flames the rebellious.' We forbear commenting on the Scriptural blunder of the infidel, that we may note the sneer with its 'measured cadence' which he directs against the sainted Cyprian, who had acquired that absolute command over the consciences of Christian people, which, more than the most despotic power achieved by arms, is truly 'grateful to the pride of the human heart,' and which must have been peculiarly so to Cyprian, who had only 'renounced those temporal honours 'which it is probable he could never have obtained.' It is certain that Cyprian was pure from the imperiousness and the ambition with which Gibbon charges him; and it is not likely that one carefully educated, who in a very few years had achieved as a rhetorician both wealth and distinction, would have failed to attain, had he cared to seek after, the unsatisfying distinctions, whether provincial or imperial, of the age which he adorned. If, indeed, the ecclesiastical organization was, as the

historian of the 'Decline and Fall' implies, a system aiming at self-aggrandizement, and instinct with the lust of conquest and domination, that organization, as a cause promotive of the spread of Christianity, turns out to be, even more than the others, a cause without any reasonably related effect; if the Church was such, as such the attempt would have been made to crush it by the sword of those Cæsars who could so ill brook even a spiritual competitor.

If for any portion of this laborious work more than another Gibbon deserves the humorous designation of *voluminous* rather than *luminous*, that portion is beyond doubt the fifteenth chapter. It is such a sketch as no honest unbeliever would have turned out. It shows fully the nakedness of the man; how wholly devoid he was of the least amount of philosophical intuition.

We have made such use, in the preceding pages, of the last work at the heading of this paper, that it seems almost out of place to praise it here. Dr. Lee's masterly lectures form an invaluable contribution to the study of Church history. Neither indulging in the rhetoric of the pulpit, nor the pyrotechnical displays of the special pleader, nor in that pompous display of his literary wares in which the infidel historian fairly revels, Dr. Lee gives us, without any apparent effort at condensation, a most graphic and living sketch of the early fortunes of the Church. An elaborate investigation of the causes of the progress of the Gospel did not come within the scope of his lectures; but he discerns the chief opponents which the Gospel was called to do battle with, and he follows a track equally removed from that selected by Mr. Merivale and Mr. Allies.

Dr. Lee contents himself with defining and illustrating one, what he regards 'the chief human, instrument' through which the Gospel gained its victory.

'Throughout the whole extent of the Roman dominions, every city, every mansion, was divided into two hostile camps, of the masters and the slaves, the tyrants and their victims. This is a fact in ancient society which it is essential to keep before the mind; not only as exhibiting one of the chief social evils with which Christianity had to grapple, but also—and this is my principal motive for dwelling upon the subject—because it appears to me to have been the chief *human* instrument through which the Gospel gained its victory. Christianity first proclaimed to the world that all men, of every colour, and every social grade, are in the highest sense equal before their Maker; that all are alike interested in its benefits, joint heirs of its promises. It is not my province to recount how both the sacred writers and the later Christian teachers treated the question of slavery—an institution so deeply embedded in the structure of Roman society—that it is a fact that servitude remained in Italy down to the thirteenth century. I may, however, remind you of the language, on this subject, of inspired and uninspired preachers of the Gospel; how "Paul the aged" besought Philemon for his "son Onesimus;" how the Alexandrine Clement reckoned, among the leading principles of the Faith, that "we should treat our domestics as ourselves, for they are human

beings as we are; and God, bethink thee, looks impartially on all, whether they be bond or free." In accordance with this principle the Church acted in each successive age. The improvement in the condition of the slave population was a subject of constant solicitude to ecclesiastical rulers and to councils; and from the hour that Christianity enjoyed toleration, the highest festivals were appointed as the seasons, and the churches as the place for manumission. You will easily perceive the important opening here offered to the progress of Christianity, and can understand how justly, under social conditions such as I have endeavoured to describe, the "preaching of the Gospel to the poor could be placed by Christ among the greatest miracles."

'I shall conclude for the present with an illustration of the principle which I wish to establish—namely, that among the slave population of the Empire the Church found some of her earliest and most numerous triumphs.

'Rome, as you are aware, is undermined in every direction by subterranean excavations, forming a maze of unknown extent, and with which we are familiar under the name of the Catacombs. The Romans had inherited from their Etruscan predecessors these excavated labyrinths, formed, in remote ages, in the process of quarrying tufo. We find allusion to these sandpits in writers long before the Christian era. The great increase of the city in the latter days of the Republic led to the reopening of the ancient excavations, in order to procure materials for building; and hence the whole subsoil on one side of Rome was gradually perforated by a network of quarries, which extended to a distance variously estimated at fifteen and twenty miles. Here resorted the "Arenarii," or sand-diggers, who, as well as the higher class of workmen, were slaves. Among the Christian memorials represented in nearly all the Catacombs are figures of men bearing instruments of labour, often instruments for the purpose of excavation, and clad in the dress peculiar to the slave. Here, then, among the despised class of the population, the workmen in the Catacombs had provided for themselves and their brethren in the faith a secure retreat—a retreat which became the established refuge of the Roman Church. The number of the Christian labourers in the Catacombs was increased, and the garrison of the Church continually recruited from the ranks of those who were condemned, as was the practice of the time, to labour in the sandpits as the punishment for abandoning the ancient Roman faith. If we read of a Christian being dragged before the tribunal, or exposed to the beasts in the amphitheatre, we are apt to think of him as one of a scattered community, few in number, and politically insignificant. But all the while there existed, literally beneath the surface of Roman society, a population unheeded, uncared for, thought of vaguely, vaguely spoken of—a population stronghearted, of quick impulses, nerved alike to suffer or to die; and in numbers, resolution, and physical force, sufficient to have caused their oppressors to quail before them. But the sword had not yet been enlisted in the cause of religion. Submissive in these "dens and caves of the earth," to the powers that be, for their Redeemer's sake, the early Christians lived and died; and here they found their sepulchre. It was reserved for Christianity first to deposit side by side persons unconnected with each other, except by the profession of a common faith.'—*Pp. 24—29.*

Nor was this the only feature characteristic of the faith in connexion with the disposal of deceased brethren. The earnest care of the dead—the reverential treatment of the body which had been anointed and consecrated by the Holy Ghost—has been mentioned by no less an authority than the Emperor Julian himself, as a very prevailing cause of the diffusion of Christianity. 'One of the means to convert so many to our

'religion was the care of the bodies, and the solemnities always 'used at the funerals of the dead.'<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Lee, having considered the condition of the slave, proceeds in his two lectures to examine the office of the Roman Emperor. The claim to divine honours put forward by the Cæsars, explains, in his judgment, the slow and painful and difficult progress of Christianity, during the protracted period of five centuries. On the closing of the Temple of Janus—

'Neither prince, nor king, nor potentate of any denomination, appeared to break the universal calm which through centuries surrounded the throne of the Cæsars. The barbarians, it is true, were accumulating in vast hordes beyond the Danube and the Rhine; the tempest, however, had as yet given but few tokens of its approach. The frontiers of the Empire were guarded by troops or bounded by forest and desert; and the proud Roman little dreamed that foes more terrible than Gaul or Carthaginian were slowly gathering around the borders. The authority consequently of the Roman Emperor, when Christianity was first preached to the world, had neither hostility to apprehend from without, nor opposition to encounter from within. His position was one that overpowers the imagination, when we approach to contemplate it. The Emperor's very title, "Imperator," marked him as the sole representative of the military power, the *Stratocracy*, as it has been happily termed, of Rome. He was himself the great fountain of law, of honour, of preferment, of civil and political regulations. The nobles of every grade were under his immediate censorship; the lowest classes were linked, in a connexion of absolute dependence, to the ruler who provided their daily food. The character of the Roman Emperor was truly and mysteriously awful.

'The religions of the world, transplanted from their native soil to Rome, had lost all their significance: the contact too of the various mythologies was necessarily followed by their mutual hostility and destruction. These contradictions could not be reconciled. The political spirit of each alone remained; and in each case was attracted, as if by an irresistible impulse, to that one self-dependent power which now filled the world. The various forms of religion united in paying this worship. Temples were raised and altars dedicated to the Emperor. Men swore by his name; they celebrated festivals in his honour; his statues afforded sanctuary—and the veneration paid to each successive Cæsar even increased in its intensity.'—Pp. 35–39.

The following extract on the troubles attending the disintegration of the Roman Empire, will complete the train of thought which we are here pursuing.

'During these dreary centuries, the one resting-place for the mind, distracted and wearied with the narrative of war and tumult, is the History of the Church. Throughout this age of anarchy and brute force, the one tie that held society together was the principle of Christian brotherhood;—the one agency that

<sup>1</sup> See the 'Patriarchal Funeral.' A sermon by Bishop Pearson (Remains, ed. Churton, vol. ii. p. 118). We may note the change in this respect which has crept over the Church. For can anything be conceived better calculated to *naturalize* death, to confirm the heedless in their apathy, and to alienate the unconverted, than the gross and dreary heathenism, and the histrionic horrors which mark our burial formalities?

had power to build again its ruined fabric was that exerted by the Christian clergy. The decomposition of the Roman Empire, and the foundation of the barbarous kingdoms into which Europe was now divided, left almost nothing remaining of what had constituted the ancient world.

'No one can have studied those dark ages of violence and bloodshed and wrongdoing, without being compelled to feel that with all their faults—and do not forget that Churchmen are but men—the individual members of the clergy and the great prelates and the councils of the Church were, in truth, the very "salt of the earth," without which the total decomposition of nations and communities could not have been checked.'

The Church, by her public teaching and missionary labour, re-organized national life, and—

'The introduction of the German race into European society—and the conquerors of the Empire were nearly all Germans—was an event of the highest importance. It put an end to the perpetual inroads of the barbarians. The calamities of the Empire were not altogether fraught with evil to the Church. The invaders were more willing to embrace Christianity than had been the subjects of the Roman Empire. But however opposed to her rapid extension were the evils with which the Church had to contend from without, the evils which sprang up within her own bosom, had a still greater tendency to retard her progress. This is the page of Ecclesiastical History over which we must blush while we sigh.'—Pp. 79—91.

The first great schism of the Church, that one which ultimately broke up the Church in Africa, might well have been overlooked by those who write about the conversion of the Empire and the triumphs of Christianity, had the Church been not one and indivisible, but a mere confederation of communities territorially distinct, any section of which might come to naught without doing damage to what remained. Donatism arose, from no reaction against either the dogma, the ritual, or the ministry of the Church, but it became the first great treason on record against the Church, and it based itself upon a principle which—most awful and affecting truth!—perpetuates the existing divisions of our times, a principle which, if in the first instance evolved by Novatus of Carthage, was successfully perpetuated by Novatianus of Rome. It was through the Divinity that resides in the Church—through Him who alone works great marvels—that the Church survived this terrible agitation, wherein so large a portion of the Church, a portion glorified by the memory of a Cyprian, and the living example of an Augustin, maintained that the sanctity of their bishops entitled their community alone to be regarded as the true and holy Church, while all others were to be shunned. In consequence of this tenet, they pronounced 'the sacred rites and institutions void of all virtue and efficacy among those Christians who were not precisely of their sentiments; and not only rebaptized those who came over to their party from other Churches, but even with respect to those who had been ordained ministers of the Gospel, they observed the severe custom, either of de-

'priving them of their office, or obliging them to be ordained a second time.'<sup>1</sup>

Here, then, we may pause for a brief retrospect. It will be useful, and it is not difficult to summarise the results of our analysis of the causes which promoted the spread of the Gospel in the first centuries.

The history of the Church, resembling that of the Israelites of old, in the fulness of its own typical and spiritual significance, presents us with seven centuries—starting from the beginning—of effort, suffering, progress, and defeat. From the martyrdom of the two witnesses in the spiritual Sodom, to the triumph of Mahomet, we traverse a period which is in truth self-defined. Between these two poles of the divine drama, there intervenes neither person or event that can sustain the contrast, or that really enters into the philosophical nexus of the plot, except the divine dogma rescued at Nicæa, and the inviolable presence of Athanasius. The thousandth anniversary of the founding of Rome found the congregations of Christians in the enjoyment of the recently acquired privilege of public churches which they could call their own. Even then the Goths had made themselves felt, and the great cathedral of Eastern Paganism perished as they came, and the great goddess Diana was left without a shrine. The importance of this event to the fortunes of the Cross can hardly be over-estimated. The commencement of this century saw the Church confronting the powers of the world with the institution of the monastic life. A.D. 313 witnessed the Edict of Milan, the governmental recognition of the Christian body as such, and in the very next year occurred the suspension of the *secular* games, an occurrence to which Zosimus attributes all the after disasters of the empire. The partiality of the pagan Constantine for the new superstition is evidenced by the existence of the Council of Nicæa, and the public respect paid to the bishops of the Church of God. By the admission of Gibbon, the Gospel had been preached in every province and in all the great cities of the empire, and the real matter of 'astonishment' is not that it had a rapid progress, but 'that its success was not still more rapid and still more universal;' and in the middle of the third century, and after a peace of thirty-eight years, the Christians of Rome perhaps formed a twentieth part of the million of inhabitants that thronged the Eternal City, while at Antioch they formed perhaps one-fifth, and, before the so-called conversion of Constantine,<sup>2</sup> we cannot suppose that more than a twentieth part of the subjects of the Empire had become the subjects of the Cross.

<sup>1</sup> Mosheim, Cent. IV. c. v. § 8.

<sup>2</sup> When, according to Mr. Elliot's Apocalyptic Chart (see '*Hæc Apocalypica*,' 1st ed.) the Roman Empire became Christendom.



In the eighty years which succeeded the date of the Nicene Council, at the very time when the Emperor was regarded more and more as a Deity, the imperceptible progress of Christianity is marked by the law of Valentinian against magic, which so seriously implicated the Neo-platonists; by the refusal (A.D. 382) of Gratian to accept the title of *Pontifex*, by the penance of Theodosius (390), and the destruction throughout the empire of the Pagan temples and shrines. The confiscation of the ecclesiastical endowments of paganism, the refusal of Theodosius to defray out of the public funds the expenses of the public sacrifices, and the abolition of all religious revenues, indicate, as distinctly as the public penance of the Emperor, the powerful influence which the faith had already acquired.

The virtual extinction of paganism as a national form of faith or imperial organization, consequent on these measures, was immediately accompanied by an event to which Dr. Lee is perhaps the first to give its full and legitimate importance. He accounts it a cardinal fact in the history of the propagation of the faith, when through the glorious martyrdom of Telemachus even the weak and womanly Honorius was so wrought upon, that he issued an edict, and 'the turbulent populace of Rome' accepted the mandate, and submitted without a murmur to 'the law which abolished for ever the human sacrifices of the 'amphitheatre' (p. 24). We have seen how, about the year 268, the Goths had cleared in the desert the highway for the Gospel, by destroying the temple of Diana, at Ephesus.<sup>1</sup> This great service which they had rendered in the East, they were about now to renew in the West. The city which had so long refused the Cross, whose conversion was so deeply despaired of by Constantine, that he raised for himself on the banks of the Bosphorus the first Christian metropolis that was ever founded, now the least Christian among all the existing cities that ever professed Christianity, the Mistress of West and East must submit to the sword of the 'rude savages from the Baltic.' The annihilation of pagan Rome in 410—for it was nothing short of annihilation, gave the Gospel to the Continent and con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Our readers will scarcely need to be reminded that the Diana of Ephesus was more nearly allied to the portentous forms and ideas of Hindu worship than to the 'elegant fictions' of classical mythology. Forgetting this, we let slip the main significance of the collision recorded in the nineteenth of Acts. In that chapter we have the first, if not the only recorded instance in Apostolic times, of the will of the Holy Ghost to encounter and subdue those Indian superstitions which to our day have remained apparently so invulnerable to the arguments or the solicitations of the missionaries of the Gospel. The ruins of the shrine retained much of their original beauty, and some of the fragments of this world-famed temple were supposed to have found their way into the cathedrals of Italy, and to have been largely introduced into the fabric of S. Sophia.

verted the barbarians. At the close of this century the last of the public pagan rites which were celebrated in the West, the Lupercalia, was abolished; yet even then so strong was the pagan instinct, that murmurs were heard alike from the senate and people. In 529 Benedict of Nursia consecrated to Christ the last relic of paganism in Italy, the altar of Apollo on Mount Cassino, and in the same year Justinian silenced at Athens the philosophical schools so hostile to the Church. The middle of the sixth century witnessed, in the re-erection of S. Sophia, the first building by a Christian Emperor of a Christian church. Contemporaneously with the building of a temple which has outlasted the vicissitudes of twelve centuries, the tolerance of the West reformed the whole system of the imperial laws, an exploit which, however it may be estimated by those deep in legal science, had no trivial influence, and lent no light aid to the diffusion of Christian morality.

But the first religious war had already (514) polluted the Christian metropolis, and Constantinople was drunk with the blood of the innocents, while Catholics availed themselves of the aid of infidel barbarians. If the influence of Christianity, however, was weak in the eastern capital, it attained its highest effect in Rome when the influence of S. Gregory was successfully employed to save the city from the Lombards. But the polemical spirit, which the growth of heresy in 150 years had diffused, was fatal to any real conversion of the Empire. The Donatists, fighting for no imperilled doctrine of the faith, and blinded with self-will, had caused the weakness of the Church in the south. Already Mahomet was on his flight from Mecca. He was soon to find an easy enemy in a land harried and distracted by the puritans and fifth-monarchy-men of the seventh century.<sup>1</sup> The sword of the Arabian soon came. The continent which was the last to receive, was the first to lose, the Gospel. The Church of Tertullian and Cyprian and Augustin is as though it had never been. The same irresistible conqueror crushed the Church in Asia, and threatened and imperilled it in Europe.

But although the facts of history command us to put away for ever the dream of a triumphant Christianity, great and manifold were the blessings bestowed on human life in those centuries.

'The Christian faith had laid its hand on the individual man, disclosing to him that he was a creature whose end lay beyond the realm of the senses and the confines of the visible world, in union with the invisible Creator. It thus recast his life, placing all virtue in the heart and inward affections, and setting before him a supreme model which had appeared in his own nature, as the Head of a new race, by virtue from whom it encompassed him with con-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Dr. Lee's Lectures, p. 92.

tinual help, by means of sacraments supporting him from the cradle to the grave. Thus it bestowed a new, unheard-of value on man's transitory life, as the passage to an infinite good. Another faith found entrance into the heathen mind by the very prodigality with which this life and all its goods were sacrificed by unnumbered martyrs of both sexes and every condition of society, for the sake of a future unseen good. And further, such a faith produced types of the highest excellence, after this new pattern, throughout every land. And the intellectual basis for this excellence was found in its doctrine, uniform and universal, which gave life and interest to its worship, and was embodied therein, and by its solid force gradually displaced the corrupt rites of heathenism, disjoined from moral teaching, and the contradictory opinions of philosophy in perpetual fluctuation. While in inseparable connexion with its doctrine and its worship, there rose before the eyes of men a new thing upon the earth, a perfect rule of spiritual government, which disarmed opposition because it was rather the exercise of a perpetual ministration, and an exquisite charity spending itself for the needs of others, than a dominion after the fashion of Babylon, wherein the kings of the nations lorded it over them.'—*Allies*, pp. 269, 270.

We have been hitherto investigating the causes which aided the propagation of the faith. In that inquiry we have not left unnoticed the *interior* and the *exterior* effects wrought upon society by the Church, and we have enumerated some of the more important reforms in the usages of the Roman Empire, which indicated that indeed the Spirit of God was moving on the face of the waters. We shall bring this paper to a close with a brief survey of the chief social, moral and intellectual hindrances which the Roman Empire presented to the progress and triumph of the Gospel. We shall leave it to our readers mainly to detect where the predominance of the same obstructive influences prevails in this our own day. We shall not attempt any scientific classification of the subject, but shall take the topics in their chronological rather than their logical order.

I. Much as the rights and privileges of Roman citizenship had been extended to the cities of the empire, the vast majority of the inhabitants of the empire formed the class of slaves. The servants were all slaves. Attempts have been made to show that the Roman was something more tolerable and humane than the American institution. The difference we believe to be more apparent than real; and though it may be true generally that the slave's condition is happier under an arbitrary than under a free government, the balance we hold to be in favour of the modern as compared with the classical slavery. For it may be pleaded on the side of slavery as it exists now, that the 'chattel' is a being as incapable of social as he is of physical assimilation; that his whole nature proves him not to be of the divinely originated race, and that, in fact, his very appearance argues the limited extent of the Deluge, and the existence of a pre-Adamite creation bearing some striking analogies to the human. But in Roman bondage the bondsmen were the natural

equals of their proprietors, their superiors only too often in all intellectual acquirements, and a large section of the slave population could lay claim to national traditions far more glorious than anything that either written record or inherited belief had as yet ascribed to the Roman name; and here was the beginning of the plague spot, the very fountain-head of the social evil of Rome. The cruelties practised under the two systems, the ancient and the modern, were very much alike. But the Roman slaves scattered through the suburbs or employed in active occupations were in a position tolerable enough, and by their very shrewdness and intelligence were fitted to be the first recipients of the great promises and gifts of the gospel. Confined, however, in the magnificent establishments of the city, the slave class became in too many instances the ready instruments for the corruption of their master's family. They not only lost, in the degradation of bondage, those safeguards of virtue which they once had, and which might have preserved them uncorrupted in their relations to one another, but they became, in most cases it may be, the unconscious agents of a terrible retribution upon their oppressors, and every Roman household was peopled with the instruments of debauchery and lust.<sup>1</sup> Men in the highest station, and those most illustrious in the rolls of literature, were guilty of unutterable sin; and not only poets and orators, but, Claudius alone excepted, all the first sixteen emperors were guilty of outraging nature and humanity. There cannot be anything more true than that the literature furnishes the moral standard of the age, except it be the other maxim, that in a legal and established constitution the vices of the leading orders reflect the real moral condition of the state. In the great revolution of modern history the writings of the French novelists and Encyclopædists, and the orgies of the Palais Royal, rendered inevitable the fast approaching catastrophe. But in this case Hell was let loose upon itself, and Christendom was called to witness the divine retribution of the Holy Ghost. But in the Roman empire the student of history beholds the gradual ripening of *heathendom* for its consummation,

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of slaves in a family varied. Horace speaks of one possessing 200, though occupying no prominent or official station. What might be the number of the slaves of Pedanius Secundus, prefect of the city, who were put to death because one of their number, under the impulse of unnatural jealousy, had murdered their master (Tacit. Ann. xiv. 42), we cannot determine with certainty, probably 5,000. They were escorted to execution by the guards of Nero. There may, after all, therefore, be some truth in the statement which Gibbon discredits, that Trajan or Hadrian crucified in one day 10,000 Christian soldiers on Mount Ararat. It may, at the same time, also be quite true that in the Decian persecution only seventeen suffered at Alexandria, 150 years later. A contempt of human life strongly marked the earlier period, when human sacrifices were (against law since B.C. 95) sanctioned by a Hadrian and a Trajan.

and a milder judgment ushering in a remedial and restorative dispensation. But we are not left to infer from classic records the social state of the Empire at the introduction of Christianity. The first page of the letter of the great Apostle to the Romans, miraculously moulding into a few sentences the whole philosophy of heathen history, tells it all, revealing with what fatal certainty man's perverse and irrational degradation of the divine nature prepares the way for the final dehumanization of humanity itself. To understand the eternal labours of the Holy Ghost whilst inrooting Christianity in the earth, we must allow our thoughts to be dazzled no longer by the 'glory that was Greece, and the grandeur that was Rome;' we must fix our eyes on the actual condition of society, and own that the armour of the strong man which was to be taken from him consisted not either in imperial laws or the ubiquitous presence of a vindictive sovereignty, but in the corrupting usages of a society utterly demoralized. Theorists and lecturers have overlooked this obvious truth. The Church as yet has known but one Pentecost. There is a prophecy and a hope of a final Pentecost yet to be, which, outdoing that which is foregone, will subdue to its marvellous agencies not individuals but nations. In the great interval the work of God is carried on as the seed which springeth and groweth man knows not how. There are no grand denouements, positively no dramatic epochs, but an orderly, graduated, and, in its progress, imperceptible development. That progress, after that the gospel was extended to the Gentiles, was slow, so mighty was the superincumbent mass of corruption through which it had to be carried. It was slow, in this respect contrasting remarkably with error, so actively antagonistic were the powers and dominions of darkness. It was slow, because, as instanced in some of the Redeemer's miracles, the case was so desperate as to be impatient wholly of a direct and normal treatment. As in the instance where the Lord *sighed* and said 'Ephphatha,' the Gentile world was so diseased as to require the very gentlest and slowest treatment. The natural reason, seeking vainly for a perpetuation of the Pentecost, marvels that the progress of Christianity was not more rapid than it really was; nay, jumping at conclusions, *makes* it more rapid than it was. But the actual results harmonize with the unquestionable facts as well as with what we must recognise as the divinely foreshown character of the dispensation of the Comforter. He who came to enable man to fill up what was behind of the sufferings of Christ, shares as well as commemorates the sorrow of the Cross; and when we are called on to acknowledge, as in this case, the slowness of converting grace, we are at the same time called to adore the

redeeming agonies, and to confess the *στεναγμοὶ ἀλλήλοι* of the Holy Ghost.

II. A scarcely less serious obstacle to the progress of Christianity at the outset is that which we are now about to mention, which has been very inadequately noticed by those who have treated of this subject. Heathenism is generally regarded as the effortless and unresisting opponent of the Cross; as an enemy that capitulated at the first sounding of the gospel trumpet; as a system that in its crisis exhibited no counteractive or recuperative powers. The facts of the case are very different. Mr. Merivale, indeed, has not been insensible to one part of this discussion. He acknowledges that Christianity did not succeed at once to the vacant inheritance of Olympus (Pref. p. xi.); and he gives a passing notice to that last shape which the 'elegant fictions,' as Gibbon calls them, of the ancient mythology assumed. As far as we have seen, he takes but very slight notice of the efforts which heathenism, all its instincts alarmed, put forth to counteract the spread of the gospel. Indeed, he mentions some of these efforts as indicating the gravitation of the heathen world through natural causes towards the acknowledgment of the cardinal doctrines of humanity (p. 103). In fact, Mr. Merivale regards the movement of enlightened heathenism as co-operant with the labours of the Church. For our own part we cannot regard this conclusion as legitimate. Mr. Allies (p. 25) is quite right in insisting on three elements in the philosophy of history—a controlling providence of God, a free-will in man, and 'an ever active power of evil, universal in its operation.' To this power, and to this alone can we trace the efforts made for the reformation and reinvigoration of heathenism. If some of the measures taken to this end alarmed the government, and filled the Cæsars with what M. Denis calls '*une feroce terreur*,' we find in this fact the justification of what we have already in substance advanced:—that the power and disposition of the Cæsars was not the main hindrance to the propagation of the gospel.<sup>1</sup> The despotic selfishness of the age viewed with equal dismay any change or awakening of conviction in the people. The certain hostility of the evil spirit, who at this very time was filling the remote East with an unreasoning faith in what is but a miserable counterfeit of the Incarnation, was no less pronounced in the West; and from him sprang the endeavours which were made to rehabilitate at this time the religion of the nations.

This age of heathen reformation is marked out by two dates: the one, the destruction of Jerusalem, in which overthrow a

<sup>1</sup> Whether Philip, who was emperor in 248, was or was not a Christian, is a question that cannot yet be said to be settled.



perverted religious system was superseded; and the other, the fall of Rome, 300 years later, when heathenism was exploded. Each city was the stronghold of a religion. At the earlier date, Vespasian was the leading actor; at the later, the Emperor Julian. The fact that Vespasian stood before the world as the scourge and exterminator of a people charged with a divine revelation, invests his person with a peculiar significance. We know that he was regarded as the Messiah of the time. We accept, without abatement, the weighty comments of Dean Jackson upon this topic.<sup>1</sup> Every agency of nature discovered and appropriated by man is so much withdrawn from the armoury and the thaumaturgic resources of the devil. In some actual and unmetaphorical sense, his coming is with the wonders of the Lie: *τέρατα* as real, *quoad nos*, as the wonders of the Lord Himself. Conqueror of the isles and of the south, lord of the west, Vespasian, who opened the eyes of the blind, invests the Holy City, and, so to speak, annihilates the race which the nations had so long regarded as the plague and torment of the earth. But not from this alone did heathenism derive renewed animation. The Emperor did not fail to avail himself of the reputation and influence of Apollonius of Tyana, who was also the contemporary of S. Paul, and Egypt was won to adopt the cause of Vespasian by the mediation of the prophet. Origen, as quoted by Brückner (B. iii. c. 2, § 2), speaks of Apollonius as one so esteemed, that no mean philosophers regarded him as capable of predicting future events; and Eusebius bears like testimony to his public influence.<sup>2</sup> Nor was that influence confined to his lifetime. His biography was extensively studied, and he was proposed to the world, whether consciously or unconsciously matters not, as a heathen counterpart of Christ. He was, in truth, the great missionary and reformer of heathenism. The successful labours of such a legislator abundantly prove that heathendom was not prepared to abandon, without a struggle, its faith in the old superstitions.<sup>3</sup> To pass to the later date; the resuscitation of pagan forms by the Emperor

<sup>1</sup> In his answer to the work of Hierocles, in which the author contrasts the Redeemer and Apollonius, to the disparagement of the former. Dr. Lee, like Bishop Pearson, seems to have confounded this Hierocles of Nicomedia, Proconsul of Bithynia, and afterwards of Alexandria, and the real author of the persecution of the Christians under Diocletian, in 302, with that Hierocles of Alexandria, who, 'the great hierophant of Neoplatonism,' suffered, in the middle of the fifth century, such exquisite tortures for his devotion to the pagan superstitions.

<sup>2</sup> On the Creed, Book I.

<sup>3</sup> He died at Ephesus, where he spent much of his life, a fact which we should bear in mind when reading of the destruction of the books of 'curious arts,' (Acts xix. 19), and meditating on the profound allusions to the mystical life which occur so frequently in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Julian was first initiated into the mysteries at Ephesus.

Julian marks the death agony of heathenism. Had Julian understood what popular paganism was, he would either have abandoned or modified his great enterprise. Perhaps the only acts which really contributed to the reanimation of paganism were the restoration of the temple rates and revenues, and the closing of the Christian schools. But with whatever success the Emperor and his followers may have laboured for the overthrow of the Cross throughout the empire, in the army an entire success crowned his efforts. Julian, who was probably as much an apostate as Constantine was a Christian, gained over the armies of Gaul and of the East, and the sacred name of Christ was effaced from the Labarum. There can also be little question that the magistrates were zealous in their several departments to emulate the army; and we cannot doubt that this falling away was as much the result of a *hypocritical* profession of the faith as of the force of imperial influence. Many had undertaken Christianity as unreflectingly as Julian himself, and readily abandoned it without his many and powerful excuses. Like the former epoch in the fortunes of Christendom which we have just considered, here too the Emperor is backed by his prophet. This recurrence of the same or analogous forms immediately calls up the divine imagery of the Apocalypse, where the agent in mystery of the Prince of this world, a *θηρίον*, is seen rising out of the sea, followed by another *θηρίον* out of the earth. Here the second unreclaimed creature is Alexander the Paphlagonian, whose memory has been preserved to our time by the Pseudomants of Lucian. He possessed, it may be, intellectual powers equal to those of Apollonius, but he was incapable of any pure and lofty purpose. An irreclaimable and desperate vagabond, he acquired by his pretences an unlimited command of the Roman populace, and a ready access to the imperial presence.<sup>1</sup> He was a pupil of a friend of Apollonius Tyaneus, and medals struck in the reign of Antoninus bear testimony to the influence which he acquired. We have introduced him, however, after so long an interval, in the reign of Julian, because the thaumaturgic revivalism of that crisis derived its impulses from the magical attainments, real or pretended, of the false prophet and his school. In the passage which Mr. Merivale quotes from Döllinger on the subject of the

<sup>1</sup> How very limited, in fact, is the inventive power of falsehood may be seen by comparing with the well-known imposition to which Mormonism owes its origin, the following identical trick of Alexander of Abonoteichus:—*Ἀφικόμενοι εἰς τὴν Χαλκηδὼνα, — ἐν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερῷ — κατορύττουσι δέλτους χαλκᾶς, λεγούσας ὡς αὐτίκα μᾶλα ὁ Ἀσκληπιδὸς σὺν τῷ πατρὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μέτεισιν εἰς τὸν Πύλον — αὐταὶ αὖ δέλτοι ἐξεπλήθους εὐρεθεῖσιν.*—Luc. Pseudo. More might be quoted apposite to the case of the 'Mormon Institution' of polygamy. Lucian's Essay is addressed to Celsus.

pretendedly supernatural phenomena of the magicians (note B B), we seem to be reading a passage from the *Cornhill*, or one of the publications of the spiritualists. It seems to have been a favourite artifice of these wizards to make the moon and stars appear on the ceiling of the room, or to produce the effects of an earthquake. And so the Neo-Platonists contrived to cheat the Emperor Julian, when Maximus conducted him into the subterraneous vaults of the temple of Hecate, and caused him to see an apparition of fire. When we reflect how much in our own time spiritualism endangers and obstructs the faith, we can in some measure judge what a serious impediment it must have proved to the Gospel at the first. Nor had the faith only to contend with these pagan revivals. Paganism, in self-defence, consented to re-model itself, and endeavoured, by introducing a new form, to perpetuate the ancient ideas of heathen religion.

We have in this fact a further proof that 'Christianity had a real, living enemy to encounter.' Roman paganism attracted to itself the several classes of superstition which prevailed in different parts of the world. Every form of heathenism was imported to Rome as if to be there tested, and to receive there, so to speak, the imperial brand. From the days of Augustus, that 'Jehu in ambition, in bloodshed, in every personal impurity,'<sup>1</sup> the Syrian Orontes had continued to carry into the Tiber the religions of the East, the old Roman idolatries in 218 give place to the worship of the sun; and the oldest superstition of our race was strangely revived in the West in the closing hours of heathenism. The frantic absurdities, and the still more frantic impurities which attended the worship of this new God, would have been longer countenanced had Elagabalus been content to forego his plans for the assassination of the Cæsar. Rome betrayed no impatience of the unspeakable atrocities of that short reign, and the gratitude of posterity is due to the Prætorian guards, who, to obviate a crime, cut short the career of this abominable and desperate fanatic. But he had time enough allowed him to enable him to establish in Rome the deities of Phœnicia, and the Jews beheld with astonishment, under the very shadow of the Capitol, stately temples erected to Baalim and Ashtaroath, and made the depositories of all the sacraments of the old faith—the Ancilia, the Palladium, and the fire. Nor did the Emperor only communicate new energy to heathenism by this easy method of importing a new object of worship; with a superiority, which in our day would be called philosophical, to the narrowness of creeds, he proposed to mould together, or to harmonize all the

---

<sup>1</sup> Merivale, p. 31. Was Jehu notorious for his personal impurity?

idols of the earth, making his own special divinity, the Sun, the centre, 'the point of re-union for the worship of the Samaritans, the Jews, and the Christians.' When we recall to mind the dread spiritual antagonists of the Cross against whom the Church is called to wrestle, we shall be disposed to discover in all this a deep and well-reasoned plot which could scarcely have originated in the prematurely enfeebled intellect of the imperial debauchee. The wisdom which prompted the foundation of a Pantheon was acknowledged by the virtuous Alexander Severus, whose gentleness towards Christians has been attributed to the influence of that half-Christian mother, whom the stupid bigotry of Gibbon prompts him invariably to write down. Severus, in his private chapel, preserved the images of Abraham, and Christ, and Orpheus, and Apollonius of Tyana. In this ecclesiastical syncretism of the Emperor, and the re-organization of the old beliefs on the part of his predecessor, may be traced the final and not a little formidable efforts of heathenism to maintain and propagate itself.

III. But beside the already existing briars and thorns to be overcome by the moral powers of the Church, there were the tares, sown almost contemporaneously and growing up together with the wheat. In the divine book of the Acts, which contains the *origines* of all ecclesiastical history, one of the most formidable opponents of the faith is presented to us in the person of Simon Magus; and it is of special significance that it is with Simon Peter of all the apostles he is brought into collision. Passing by all the debateable questions connected with this remarkable person, enough remains to place it beyond doubt that he is to be regarded as the founder of Gnosticism. It is keenly argued just now that the prevailing notion of an oriental theosophy, a philosophy introduced into the classic world by Zoroaster, and restored by the influence of Manes, is really groundless; for that the kindred speculations of the Porch and the Academy were published long before the date alleged for the transmission of these Indian religious theories to the West. It belongs not to our subject to discuss this question beyond observing that many analogies and facts seem to favour the conclusions hitherto arrived at; while the advocates of the new theory seem to limit their investigations to the comparatively modern religion of Buddhism. However the question may affect classic writers, in the case of the Jews the matter is very different; and it can hardly be questioned that gnosticism took its rise in a bastard Judaism; that it aimed at blending together much of the old revelation and the theosophical ideas of the East, which must have become familiar to many of the children of the Dispersion; and that this amalgamation was brought

about by the smallest possible infusion of Christianity. That in the course of its development, gnosticism should have branched off into a distinctly pagan profession is what might have been anticipated. It thus presented a kind of religious symbol to the many rationalists of the day who had cast off their allegiance to the pagan superstitions, and so succeeded in alienating for a longer time an innumerable company from the divine philosophy of the Cross.<sup>1</sup> South complains of those who wherever the word *gnosis* occurs in the New Testament immediately detect the followers of Cerinthus and Valentinus. But there can be no doubt that the apostles constantly refer, in the language of severe condemnation, to those conclusions of the merely speculative faculty which were regarded as equivalent, or supplementary to the express revelations of God. The gnostics seem to have theorised much as the Brahmin when he dreams of God, and perhaps the influence of the East on the religious susceptibility of the age may be traced in the *way of thinking* rather than in the *thoughts* themselves. Probably, too, it is the inevitable tendency of the human mind, relieved from the anchor of an historical faith with its divine record, to theorise, until with the disciples of Buddha, failing by wisdom to find out God, we arrive at virtual atheism. The Jews had their sacred books and ritual; the classic nations had their images; only in the East could be found the worship of immaterial forms, and a faith fed upon endless genealogies. At the very time when the gospel had unfolded to the soul of man the mystery of the divine nature, these tare-like fancies of the carnal mind took root in Christian society, and it was not until the fifth century that the conflict could be said to have come to an end by the virtual disappearance of the evil. Another testimony to the slow movement of divine grace, and the strength of the perverted will of man.

IV. Christianity, Mr. Merivale tells us, is history. It is more: it is the philosophy of history. It is philosophy, too, in its only real shape. The collision between the philosophy of Revelation and the philosophies of the pagan world is stated in the memorable discussion between the Apostle of the Gentiles and 'certain of the Epicureans and the Stoics.' As the two persecutions of the Christians as such, the earliest and the worst are traceable to the influence of the philosophers, this branch of the subject demands a passing notice.

There were two schools of philosophy originated among the Greeks, the Ionic and the Italic school. Epicurus (b.c. 352),

<sup>1</sup> See Waterland, vol. iii. 542—554. Burton refers to the neologic *gnosis*, 1 Cor. viii. 1—7; xii. 8; xiii. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 6; viii. 7; x. 5; xi. 6. See 'Messias and Anti-Messias,' p. 195, n. 8.

the Apostle of the Flesh, was the most illustrious doctor of the latter; Zeno (b.c. 270), the Apostle of the Soul,<sup>1</sup> was the famous teacher of the former. Before them one had taught who was afterwards to resume, under a modified form, his old, or more than his old, dominion—Plato, who may in truth be well designated the Apostle of the Spirit, who ‘aspire à la vision face à face du divin.’<sup>2</sup>

Athens was the birthplace of these speculative systems; and at Athens S. Paul made fewer converts than at any other of his missionary stations. Those systems had already run their whole course before Christianity was published to the world. In the Augustan age they divided the world between them, other schools of speculation having practically merged into them; and the sceptical spirit of the age, which Cicero, perhaps, did more to foster than any other writer, was weighing the merits of these conflicting schools. As there was much truth held by each of them, it cannot be a matter of surprise that they should have so long survived the first propagation of the Gospel.

No sentiments could be well devised more calculated to impede the spread of the Gospel than the vulgar corruptions, so widely diffused in the first Christian age, of the ethical system of *EPICURUS*. Happiness in the indulgence of the senses is a gospel most welcome to the natural man; hence the wide diffusion of the influence of the Garden. All the friends of Cicero were, with few exceptions, Epicureans. The court was Epicurean; so was the army. Lucian says that Pontus was overrun with Epicureans and Christians. But, according to the note in Gibbon, in the middle of the third century, in the extensive diocese of Neocæsarea there were only seventeen believers. The poets were the popular teachers; and they, Lucretius, Horace, Virgil, were Epicureans. There was nothing attractive to the mass of the people in the self-denying, self-deifying theories and rules of the Porch. Wherever these failed, there Epicurus succeeded. His success, indeed, is partly to be ascribed to the fact, that alone of the philosophic schools, that of Epicurus rejoiced in a small endowment, and, unlike the Stoics, could pride itself on the three hundred treatises of its founder. It may be said to stand indirectly related to those modern schools which give an undue weight to experience based upon outward observation.

We have called Epicurus the Apostle of the Flesh in no dis-

<sup>1</sup> From the *apathy* of the Stoics and its resemblance—surely more apparent than real—to the *nirvāna* of the Buddhists, an endeavour has been made to prove the independent origin of many Western ideas supposed to have been derived from the East. Epictetus was a Phrygian. Some of the most eminent of the Stoic doctors were natives of Tarsus.

<sup>2</sup> M. Deni, quoted by Merivale, p. 191.



paraging or condemnatory sense. In fact, he it was, and he alone, who vindicated the dignity of the human frame, and censured that ἀφειδία σώματος which, strange to say, is so natural to man, which leads to so much ascetical extravagance, and which eventually became a characteristic feature in the doctrine of the Porch. In a philosophical way, indeed, it might be said, to the same effect as Mr. Merivale speaks in a passage quoted above, that this assertion of the importance of the body was a preparation of Christianity. Rather might we say that the assertion of such an obvious truth—no sooner put on record than corrupted and forgotten—was the judgment of that world which, as such, loves not to retain the knowledge of the truth, whose condemnation is that at every incoming of light it turns itself to the darkness.

It is a singular fact that history preserves no name of illustrious Epicureans of the time of S. Paul; or, indeed, of a later age, if we except Celsus, the friend of Lucian, the reputed author of the *Λόγος ἀληθής*, which drew forth from Origen a refutation. It is of little moment to us whether Celsus was or was not the author of this work; all we need to know for our present purpose is past question—that at the beginning of the third century Epicureanism was so hostile to Christianity as to force it to defend itself; and that on every side the Faith had to encounter the sensualism of human nature, no longer vagrant and diffused, but organized into an intellectual system that called itself a philosophy.

The *Stoics* were the Pharisees of the Gentile world, and they justify their claim to be so designated, not merely by their unflinching devotion to their own ethical system and an egotistical assertion of their own superiority to the rest of mankind, but by their hatred of the Cæsars, and by their success in leaving the whole body of Roman jurisprudence with their own ethical system, as the Pharisees of Scripture had diffused their own legal and moral theories among the Jewish people. The pride generated by the Stoic system was what, we may believe, drove it into such marked antagonism to the Gospel. Alexander Knox, in his 'Remains,' speaks of the maxims of Epictetus as a 'cutting in stone,' which presents an astonishing likeness of what the Gospel presents alive.<sup>1</sup> We are more alive to the differences than to the resemblances, and we can discover no peculiar likeness between the maxims of Zeno and of Revelation. That happy expressions of truth are to be found here, such as an Apostle might have quoted, as S. Paul has quoted the line of Menander, we do not mean to question; but a philosophical

---

<sup>1</sup> Correspondance, Vol. i. p. 174.

system without a God—save the soul of each, and that one whose end is to be annihilation—a system wholly and exclusively subjective—can only by accident resemble the Gospel. A greater consciousness of the necessity of prayer, and a more sincere use of prayer—a necessity and a use which was probably learned from the synagogue—no doubt marks the third century of the Christian era. Whether others were alive or not to the necessity of prayer we cannot say, but the Stoics were certainly ; and if their writings were devoid of exhortations to virtue, this may have been because the ‘true exemplar of virtue was wanting’ (Merivale, p. 97). It was inevitable that the Stoic should take a gloomy view of the government and the times altogether, and of human life especially.

‘I have spoken of the sadness which prevades the atmosphere, so to say, of the New Testament; deeper sadness, deeper because unrelieved by the revelation of a greater gladness, prevades not less completely the atmosphere of secular history under the sway of declining heathenism; deeper because of the contrast of the inner spirit of heathen society. S. Paul is sad, S. John is pensive; but the Christian S. Paul is not so sad as the philosopher Seneca; the Christian S. John is not so pensive as the philosopher Aurelius.’—*Merivale*, p. 19.

This is, perhaps, oddly expressed, and may be objected to on other grounds; but it points truly to the actual state of things. Madness there might be, but joy there was not in all the world. Philosophy, by narrowing its basis, and recognising only an aristocracy of souls, marred its own work; and Aristotle forged the chain, the material for which Plato had put in the furnace.

‘The ethical speculations of Plato and his followers led them to conceptions, hitherto unimagined, of man’s position here below. Such ideas as these, refused and exalted as they were under the system of the Stoics, may transport us beyond the sphere of Greece and pure Grecian speculation. They breathe the spirit of Ebionites in the wilderness, of Persian Magi in the plains of Media, of Brahmans by the banks of the Indus and the Ganges; and it was, no doubt, by all these and kindred elements that they were modified and coloured. The fusion of nations under one yoke tended, I say, to a fusion of ideas, and resulted in a marked elevation of heathen sentiment. From these lofty abstractions they seemed to realize a supreme existence,—and this is the point at which the highest Grecian philosophy culminates. The philosophy of the Stoics, the highest and holiest moral theory at the time of our Lord’s coming—the theory which most worthily contended against the merely political religion of the day, the theory which opposed the purest ideas and the loftiest aims to the grovelling principles of a narrow and selfish expediency in which the frame of the heathen ritual rested—was the direct creation of the sense of unity and equality disseminated among the choicer spirits of heathen society by the results of the Macedonian conquest. It was the philosophy of Plato, influenced and harmonized by the political circumstances of the times. It was what Plato would have imagined had he been the subject of Alexandria.—*Ibid.* pp. 52—60.

How then was the Stoic school affected to Christianity? Did the possession of so many inklings of the truth smooth the

way to the recognition of the Cross?<sup>1</sup> It ought, assuredly, if there is any weight in the drift of Mr. Merivale's reflections. The very reverse is the fact. The age which witnessed the revival of Stoicism, when the philosophy of the Porch was a fashion, is the age of *Apologies*, and that implies was the age of persecution. Other persecutions were prompted by personal dislike, or by political distrust, or they were limited to the city or to a province. The discredit of having first persecuted the Church for being such, attaches to the memory of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. This is a fact which we cannot too highly value; for it is the highest conceivable illustration of the infinite distance which lies between nature and grace. Beside the horrible tortures inflicted all over the Empire in obedience to the edicts of the Emperor, he was the first ruler who before Mahomet succeeded in almost wholly exterminating an integral portion of the Church.<sup>2</sup> He succeeded to the purple at a time when a great measure of content prevailed everywhere; and he has obtained the credit of ruling with success where all that was needed was to be quiet. He was quiet till wrought upon by the offended philosophers around him,—Crescens probably in the number, who has been frequently charged with the death of S. Justin Martyr,—he allowed the instincts of the philosopher to overmaster the humanity of the sovereign. Aurelius is always before the scenes. He was neither as true nor as worthy, nor by any means so gifted a man as the Emperor Julian. But enough has been said to illustrate the difficulties which the Stoic philosophy put in the way of the Church.

Our limits have been overstepped already. But we must complete our subject by a brief notice of the Neo-Platonic

<sup>1</sup> It is a painful question, was the virtuous Seneca, the contemporary of S. Paul, the accomplice of Nero in the murder of Agrippina?

<sup>2</sup> The Churches of Lyons and Vienne. Recent investigations have succeeded in clearing M. Aurelius of the guilt of the death of Justin Martyr. The studied silence of this emperor respecting Christianity is the supreme proof of the pre-tentiousness of his whole character, and confirms our suspicion as to his being the author of what is preserved to us as his. This emperor had, like many other imperial Surfaces, a rich supply of the noblest sentiments. And he has been ranked with S. Louis, and with Alfred, and pronounced 'perhaps the most beautiful figure in history.' (Arnold's *Essay*.) He had a son whom he let go to ruin: Vespasian corrected Domitian. Yet even Commodus was gracious to the servants of the Cross. He had a wife whom, without effort to restrain her, he allowed to go the same course. He turned his misfortunes into crimes. He was wholly insensible to the infamy of his son's life; and he continued to him the rank which enabled him to sin more conspicuously. Above all, he was the first emperor probably who knew, or who could have really known the true character of what he persecuted. It is a pity that he who conceived of 'a polity where there should be the same law for all,' who in all he put his hand to 'first asked is this one of the necessary things,' and who, whatever he did, 'did it with a purpose' should have illustrated these very splendid maxims by torturing those of his subjects who happened to be Christians.

school; that 'religious idealism' by which the heathen 'were brought nearer to Christian ideas' (Merivale, p. 236); may we add, for the last time, without any impulse to conversion being communicated. Philo, the contemporary of S. Paul, may be regarded as its founder, the first teacher of the heathen school of Gnosticism to which a reference was made above (p. 38). Nor can we doubt that in the course of the 15th of 1 Corinthians, the speculations of this philosopher engage the thoughts of the Apostle, and that the solemn statement, 'the first man is of the earth earthy,' was drawn forth by the theories of Philo as to the prior existence of the heavenly man.<sup>1</sup> This new system absorbed in itself the Peripatetics, the Platonists, the Sceptics; and thus seemed at once to insure the sympathies of a large part of the more reflecting of the age.

'Of this new religion, the religion of the purest and most spiritual-minded of the later heathens, of this combination of a creed and a philosophy, which is known by the name of the New Platonism, I have little room here to speak. I would only remark upon it as a special, and in the West, an unique example of a dogmatic faith evolved from the pure reason. A religion professedly based on the historical records of a revelation we can fully understand; a religion resting upon mere unhistorical tradition is too common to excite our surprise; again a philosophy which seeks for spiritual truths in the light of the natural reason may be a legitimate effort of the human mind; but such a philosophy makes no pretensions to be a religion. But the New Platonic was different from all these, for it combined with such a philosophy the gratuitous assertion of a dogmatic creed, the issue of mere caprice or guess-work. It was, in fact, the engrafting of the Oriental Mithraism upon the moral philosophy of the Platonists and Stoics. It asserted the existence of a divine hierarchy, culminating in a supreme essence, a triple Godhead involving unity, soul, and intelligence, but descending again from development to development, from emanation to emanation, through a long series of divinities. Thus not raising man to God, but bringing God down to man. But with this oriental divination of a personal Godhead were combined the spiritual aspirations of the Grecian philosophy. This wild scheme of human religion, this last utterance of expiring heathenism points, it seems to me, to two things. First, it points to the need men evidently began now to feel of a personal relation to God. And secondly, it points to the evident imitation of Christianity, the conscious plagiarism upon Gospel truth, which marks the last development of religion among the heathen.'—*Merivale*, pp. 119—121.

We are disposed to demur to both these conclusions of our gifted author. We fail to discover any ground for the supposition that there was throughout these years any peculiar awakening of the conscience of heathendom to the sense of spiritual destitution; and what Mr. Merivale supposes was plagiarised from the Gospel, we think was furnished by the Kabala, and Plato, and the East. It is enough that Neo-Platonism did not in any instance on record promote conversions to the Faith; and so little prejudiced in favour of the Gospel were its

<sup>1</sup> Compare Philo, *Mund. Opific.* c. xlvii.

teachers in the beginning of the fourth century, that to them we are indebted for that persecution under Diocletian, whose fears they so forcibly wrought upon that he almost annihilated Christianity. The four edicts took effect in every part of the empire but Gaul. And the ex-slave from Dalmatia, who by his wise reforms did more for the monarchy than any ruler since Augustus, commanded Christians to be tortured under the notoriously false charge of firing his palace. Then all the clergy were imprisoned. The third edict commanded that they should be tortured. The fourth edict, issued in the next year, required all Christians to sacrifice. The malignant spirit which prompted the philosophers of the New Academy to persecute the Church continued to the end, only in God's good providence they never again had the same opportunity of carrying their hate into execution.

The forms of human error are permanent. Even to this day certain of the Epicureans and the Stoics, and many of the syncretists encounter the Apostle; and the Church, inheritor of the as yet 'unfulfilled renown' of Christ, must admit that she looks upon an empire unconverted, and a Christendom still unformed. The history of the Church is the history of a frustrated hope: of labours apparently unfruitful, and sufferings that seem ineffectual. And thus fulfilling her destiny, she shares the baptism and drinks the cup of Him whom she adores. But this being so, the greatest danger to the Church will be in days of apathy and *complacency*, when she fancies that she is always conquering, always treading upon the high places, always extending her dominions. Be we very sure that she who thus presumes 'to sit as Queen' is ceasing to be a bride. Instead of looking to the day of judgment, she is taking pledges of time, and making sure of her own secular aggrandizement. Hence the outbreaks of an angry astonishment when she is called to face trouble, which is ever unlooked for; at the apparition of mitred heresy and priestly unbelief. Resentment for invaded peace takes the place of sorrow for a fallen soul; in shaping her course during days of rebuke, more care is taken to secure the praise of men than the defence of the truth. The evil of our lotus-eating age springs from a forgetfulness of the unchangeable characteristics of the Church. She has to labour now as though—so much has she lost—she had never yet laboured at all; she must struggle now, as at the first, against an empire but partially and feebly reclaimed, and against the profane assumptions of the powers of the earth. Where there is no struggle there is no life. Where there prevails an ignorance of what has been from the beginning, are, and must ever be the great opponents of the Gospel, *there* there must

exist an alarming insensibility to the teaching of divine grace; a low standard of personal holiness; a still lower standard of ecclesiastical life.<sup>1</sup> Let it be ever reigning in our thoughts—let it be ever ringing in our ears, what the Spirit *saith*—in the perpetual present of His own dread word—to that Church which, the seventh, might once have been nearest to the Speaker—that Church which was so miserable, and pitiful, and poor, and blind, and naked, yet claimed to be rich and independent: ‘I know thy works.’ They show that thou art neither hot nor cold. ‘So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.’

---

<sup>1</sup> Contrast the celebrations of the Holy Eucharist at the beginning of the Church with the fact that it is celebrated weekly now in perhaps not 200 of all the thousand churches in the British empire.



ART. III.—*Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam illustrantia*. Quæ ex Vaticani, Neapolis ac Florentiæ tabulariis deprompsit et ordine chronologico disposuit AUGUSTINUS THEINER, Presbyter Congregationis Oratorii, Consultor SS. Congregationum indicis librorum prohibitorum, Episcoporum et Regularium ac sancti officii, Collegii Theologorum Archigymnasii Romani, Academiæ Pontificiæ Archæologiæ, Herculaneensis aliarumque plurium Academiarum socius, tabulariorum Vaticanorum Præfectus, &c. &c. Ab Honorio PP. III. usque ad Paulum PP. III. 1216–1547. Romæ: Typis Vaticanis, 1864.

PROBABLY no work which has been published in the present century will furnish more useful additions to the ecclesiastical history of Ireland and Scotland, or will serve the purpose of checking and correcting the accounts given by the annalists of these two countries, better than this volume of Documents, now first published from the Vatican manuscripts. They have been arranged, so at least the editor tells us, in chronological order, and at the head of each separate paper, a very brief epitome of its contents is given, with a reference to the volume from which it has been extracted. And these *Argumenta* have been copied exactly and reprinted in thirty pages of letter-press prefixed to the volume. A page and a half of preface, containing a dedication to Paul Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland, and Legate of the Holy Apostolic See, and an *Index Virorum et Locorum Præcipuorum*, complete the work, which consists of about six hundred pages, handsomely printed in double columns, on a large-sized folio.

Of the mode of the execution of this volume we had formed our own judgment before we had seen the preface or discovered the faults of carelessness and ignorance which it exhibits. But in describing this work for the benefit of our readers, with all its excellencies and all its faults, we shall proceed in a straightforward course from the beginning to the end. And without calling special attention to false concords and ungrammatical arrangements of sentences, we begin by simply transcribing the first sentence of the dedication, only observing further, that our transcript is, *verbatim et literatim*, correct, and that it is not our Latin, but M. Theiner's, that the reader fails to construe, if he does fail. We do not think it worth while to call attention to the errors by the insertion of

any *sic*, but leave the sentences to tell their own tale, consoling our readers with the assurance that if they cannot make M. Theiner's Latin square to their views of grammar, neither can we accommodate them to ours. It is to be hoped that M. Theiner's Latinity is not a specimen of the style of composition adopted by the students at the Irish College, when the present Papal Legate presided over its studies, and was educating its inmates for the service of the Roman Church in Ireland. The Preface begins as follows:—

*'Suavissima adhuc illorum dierum recordatio me tenet, cum Tibure feriis æstivis una commemorantes mutuis alternisque sermonibus per amœna viarum in-ambulantibus mirifice delectabamur. Qui autem Hibernorum collegio, ibidem tunc temporis rusticanti, præceras, juvenes, enim illos in spem Hibernensis Ecclesiæ succrescentes jamdudum in Urbe ad omnem virtutum genus pro tuâ sapientiâ rite excolebas facile de his quæ ad institutum tuum pertinere arbitrareris, necum ita colloquebaris, ut sermo ad tuæ patriæ res fortunasque evolvens sponte delaberetur. Et sane quo amoris ac doloris sensu animum utriusque nostrûm affici æquum erat, cum historicas illius gentis vicissitudines, quod ad Religionem potissimum attinet, mente relegeremus et præsentia malorum intueremur. Quis enim satis demiretur incredibilem illam pietatem immobilemque in Catholica fide proflendâ constantiam a majoribus acceptam, in qua adeo fixas a primis usque temporibus Hibernenses egerunt radices, ut nullis unquam motibus labefactari vel dimoveri potuerint, cum vel contra tyrannicas leges, vel perversorum hominum vim ac versutias illis perpetuo dimicandum?'*

We confess we were puzzled at the first few instances of M. Theiner's want of scholarship and general knowledge which came in our way. We were at a loss to account for them, and thought of attributing the mistakes to the compositors, or to the correctors of the press. But the execution of the work is too uniformly slovenly and inaccurate to allow of any such defence of its editor. We soon ceased to be surprised at the brevity of the epitomes prefixed to the letters, for it is evident that M. Theiner is profoundly ignorant not only of Latin Grammar, but of Scottish and Irish History. Accordingly the description of these documents is poor and meagre in the extreme; and not only is it defective, but in many cases it is such as is calculated to mislead the reader. No one of course would be for a moment puzzled by the information that in the year 1226 A.D. a breve was addressed by Honorius the Third to the prelates of Ireland, for a collection to be made in aid of Charles, King of England. An anachronism involving a discrepancy of some centuries is of no importance whatever, except as it serves to illustrate the general accusation we are making against the editor of this volume. And the explanation of this absurd mistake would not be worth inserting here, if it were not with the view of warning our readers against trusting too implicitly to the accuracy of M. Theiner's copies. Upon looking at the copy of the breve as printed at p. 25, we find that the King of England is mentioned in the

usual terms, with the single exception that the initial K. is substituted for the Christian name at full length. The mistake is evident. M. Theiner did not know the name of the reigning monarch in 1226, and read K for H, which no doubt appears in the breve itself as the initial letter of *Henricus*, and stands for Henry the Third, whose reign, as everybody knows, included the year 1226, in its nearly fifty-seven years' duration.

We suppose we may, without any breach of charity, account on the same principle of ignorance of history, and partly, perhaps, want of skill in deciphering and editing documents, for the strange fact that no attempt has been made to fill the blanks which here and there appear in the course of these letters. In some instances these may possibly have been blanks in the originals; but in most cases they are due to the inability of the editor or his amanuensis to read the document or to supply the link when a MS. had been partially destroyed by the agency of wet or fire. In the same letter which we have been speaking of, the initial of the name of the Archbishop of Dublin has been omitted, and no attempt has been made to supply the blank.

After all, it may be said that we are making an accusation which applies only to the history of these little islands, which are now united under one dominion, and that keepers of foreign libraries are very indifferent to the affairs of the countries of which we Englishmen think so much, and sometimes even ostentatiously proclaim their ignorance of English affairs. It might possibly be thought a sufficient reply to this, that M. Theiner, by his own showing, is not indifferent to the affairs of Ireland and Scotland, but rather with the excusable, if not commendable, zeal of an editor for his own subject is somewhat inclined to magnify its importance. Unquestionably no man ought to have attempted to illustrate any portion of history without knowing something about it to begin with, and no man ought to have finished such a work for the press without knowing a great deal of the subject upon which he has or ought to have been working. But we fear we must enlarge our accusation against M. Theiner into a charge of gross carelessness, if not ignorance, as regards the ecclesiastical affairs of his own Church.

An ecclesiastic holding offices of importance at Rome, such as require four long lines of a folio page to describe them, might at least have been expected to know under whose pontificate the papers he prints were written, and to what pope they were addressed. Now if we turn to pp. 534—536 of this volume, we shall find five letters addressed, three of them by the king, two by the Cardinal of York, to the pope of the

time, whom M. Theiner calls Hadrian the Sixth. Now the Cardinal of Tortosa, who assumed upon his election to the Papacy the name of Hadrian VI. sat in S. Peter's chair from the very beginning of January, 1522, till September 24, 1523, when he died, and was succeeded by the Cardinal de Medici, who makes so conspicuous a figure in the history of the time as Clement the Seventh. Who would ever have expected that a Jesuit resident at Rome, publishing papers from the stores of the Vatican Library, should have attributed five letters addressed from England to Clement VII. in February, 1524, to the preceding year, and have arranged them 'in chronological order' under the pontificate of Hadrian VI.? Readers of course will say, Oh, the thing is impossible; the mistake is on the part of the reviewer and not the editor. We should not be surprised if that should be the first impression of every reader of this article; so we hasten to do away with the impression by explaining that these letters are indeed dated February 22, 23, and 24, 1523, but what M. Theiner failed to see is, that the date is given as all letters of that period were dated, *secundum computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. In other words, the year in England began on the 25th of March, and all letters written in the first three months of the new year, according to the Roman method, are dated when written from England by Englishmen with the date of the previous year. This custom, as is well known, prevailed till 1752, when the mode of reckoning the year from the first of January began to be adopted. Every one who has looked into an English book of history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, must have seen the double date that was in use for these first three months in the year, *e.g.* January 30, 1648-9, for the Martyrdom of King Charles I. and one might have expected even a foreign ecclesiastic to have been possessed of sufficient curiosity to inquire into the phenomenon. But M. Theiner's researches had not proceeded so far as this;—and thus, with regard to nearly a tenth of the documents in his volume, he has printed them under the wrong year, and so caused a confusion in the chronology against which the reader has perpetually to be on his guard. We shall not have occasion to refer to these five documents again, so we will complete our case as regards these papers by saying that every one of them contains internal evidence which might have satisfied any inquirer as to the time of their composition, though there had been no date appended to any of them. The historical incidents to which they relate are the selection of Campeggio, as *noster regnique nostri protector apud Vestram Beatitudinem*, the conferring of the legatine power for life on Wolsey, and the

office of collector on Vannes. Whilst we are on the subject of these letters, it may not be improper to notice that one of them appears amongst the Vatican transcripts in the British Museum, assigned to its proper place as a letter from Wolsey to Clement VII. thanking him for the grant of the legatine power during life. To understand from this how easy it was to have determined the date of these letters, we may add that Wolsey had been made legate *a latere* for a time by Pope Leo X. and that the legatine power had been prolonged by Hadrian, but that it was only at the accession of Clement VII. that Wolsey obtained the grant for life. Before finally dismissing these five unfortunate letters, we may be permitted to observe, that they exhibit the same average amount of careless copying which characterizes the whole volume. We do not profess to have read the whole of the documents, and certainly have not critically investigated their defects. But mistakes in copying, and printing, and editing, occur, we are persuaded, in every page of the volume. Independently of the five wrong dates, and the entering of the wrong pope's name, we have a few insignificant variations from the English copy of the Vatican transcripts, which we do not insist on, though the variations are plainly such as to show that M. Theiner is wrong and the other transcriber right.

But upon looking at the headings of the letters respectively, we find they are not only very briefly, but also in some cases erroneously described. Thus the second is spoken of as if it conferred the legatine power upon the Cardinal of York, whereas the contents show that it is a confirmation and perpetuation of a power previously conferred by the Pope's predecessor. And if the contents of the letter be examined, we find one sentence made nonsense of by the omission to supply two words which have been destroyed in the original, and the wrong copying, as we suspect, of one or two other words—and another sentence containing the word *nuto*, we suppose for *nutu*. Neither can it be supposed that the editor has faithfully followed the originals in these instances, for this letter was written by Vannes, who was singularly accurate with his pen, and was not at all likely to have made a mistake in transcribing a letter which was to be signed by the king and sent to the pope. Again, the heading of the last letter, which at least is M. Theiner's and not Vannes', is as follows:—'*Cardinalis . . . regem Angliæ ob eccelsum (sic) . . . animum . . . commendat*. We do not scruple to say, that the faults of printing and editing in this volume may be counted not only by hundreds but by thousands.

Before we go on to speak of the contents of this volume, we

have one other fault to find. The pains bestowed on the Index are about on a par with the labour given to the rest of the work. It is really disgraceful that a work containing historical documents of the very highest value and importance should be concluded by a short Index of exactly three pages. Of course, upon turning to it, we find that many of the principal persons and places, to say nothing of subjects, have been entirely omitted; and that many more, though they appear as headings, have not nearly so many references as they ought to have.

For the present then we have done with our task of complaining, and shall content ourselves with an occasional growl when in describing the contents of the volume we light upon some glaring mistake on the part of its editor.

We have already said that the contents of the volume are of the highest value. We have here a selection of documents mostly printed from the Vatican MSS. though some are from other sources, ranging over three centuries and a half, from the pontificate of Innocent III. to the death of Paul III. or in other words from the accession of Henry III. to the death of Henry VIII. The title-page gives a somewhat inadequate idea of the book. The '*Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum*,' do indeed, for the first 500 pages, contain papers which relate to Irish and Scottish affairs, but for the last hundred refer almost as exclusively to English history. We purpose to give a brief account of both portions, but before we do so, venture to express the hope that M. Theiner's labours may be continued through the two succeeding reigns of English history, and that he will include English documents in his collection; and let us be permitted to add, will be a little more exact in his chronology and more careful in his collation of documents. If he will but attend to these suggestions, M. Theiner may produce a second volume, far superior in execution to his first, and perhaps even more interesting as regards its contents.

And, first of all, the value of this volume may be estimated by the fact that not a single document which appears in it has been incorporated into our own 'Collection of Councils.' Wilkins' '*Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae*,' is singularly deficient in its earlier parts on the relations of England and Rome, and it scarcely contains any document illustrative of Scotch or Irish affairs. This, however much it may be regretted, is easily accounted for when it is remembered that Wilkins' laborious collections were mostly drawn from the Archiepiscopal Registers of Canterbury and York, and a few other provincial registers. We suppose we shall see not a few of these documents reprinted in the new edition of the '*Concilia*'



which it is understood the delegates of the Oxford University Press have in hand.

We have not compared this volume minutely with Rymer's *Fœdera*, so we are unable to pronounce absolutely that none of the documents printed by M. Theiner appear in our own great national collection. But we cannot be wrong in saying that if there are any, they are very 'few and far between.' In giving our readers some idea of these interesting documents, it is obvious to divide them on the national principle, and we begin with the Irish. We do not profess to notice all, or even the majority of these papers. So we simply dismiss a considerable portion of them with the observation that they are merely official documents, a sample of which would, we think, have been amply sufficient. Such are the numerous instances recorded of the investiture, by the pope, of the Irish archbishops with the pall. As no one disputes the fact that this was done, it was needless to repeat a document which appears, *mutatis mutandis*, upon the appointment of nearly every archbishop in succession to the sees of Armagh, Tuam, Dublin, and Cashel. In a complete repertory of Irish ecclesiastical history no doubt it might be advisable to insert nearly every such paper, because every one contains some variation, if only in the names of the persons concerned in the transaction; and doubtful points of history may sometimes be cleared up by the concurrence of a certain name and a certain date. But M. Theiner's volume is not on so extensive a scale as to warrant this; and we must, therefore, express our regret that so much space has been occupied with the documents about the pall in Irish history, and the appeals in matrimonial cases which appear to have been so frequent in the annals of Scotland. To this latter subject we shall recur hereafter. For the present we return to Irish affairs. Independently of mere official papers—such as are found as a matter of course in connexion with vacancies of bishoprics or abbeys, and promotions to ecclesiastical dignities—the first class of documents we have to notice are the inquiries into the conduct of accused ecclesiastics. And here, what strikes us first, is the superiority of the Irish clergy over the Scottish. We cannot suppose that M. Theiner has had it in view to draw out this point, which, after all, requires the eye of a reviewer to discover. We take it for granted, therefore, that in the chances of things the comparative numbers of these investigations which appear in these pages represent with tolerable fidelity the true state of the case. Some deduction must be allowed on the score that in Ireland many offences of the inferior clergy, or even of bishops, would have been settled by the archbishop of the province,

without any appeal to Rome; whereas, in Scotland, such cases would in most instances have gone direct to Rome, owing to the absence of metropolitan jurisdiction in any of the native bishops.

The first instance of the kind is a breve from Pope Honorius the Third to the Elect of Armagh, directing him to reduce the number of fifty-eight priests, who were required to testify to the life and conduct of a priest accused of murder by bribed witnesses, to seven, on the ground that it was impossible to find so many priests in the diocese who could speak the Irish language. It appears that the priest made his appeal from the archbishop, who had deposed him, to the pope, who directed him to be restored if he could make good his case by seven priests: '*quatenus ab eo de canonicâ purgatione cum septimâ sacerdotum manu infra terminum competentem præstandâ, sufficienti cautione receptâ.*' This document occupies half a column only. And it contains at least two, and we are inclined to suspect four, mistakes, two being certainly mistakes in printing, the other two being probably mistakes of editing. With regard to accusations against bishops and archbishops, they seem mostly to take the form of charges of simony, to which other charges are added to make the case as complete as possible. Thus we have illegitimacy of birth, incontinency, and other accidents or crimes, as the case may be, foisted into the appeal, which in many cases seems to imply personal hostility between the parties.

One of the worst cases of the kind is No. cxii. at p. 43. It is in many respects a remarkable document. It contains a process of inquiry directed to be made by Pope Innocent IV. into the conduct of the Bishop of Aghadoe. The breve is not addressed to the neighbouring bishops, nor to the archbishop of the province, but to an abbot, a prior, and the archdeacon of the diocese, directing them to inquire into the matter and report to the pope. The crimes alleged were of a sufficiently fearful character, being, that the bishop had, as a young man not yet of age, married a woman who had been previously connected with another man; that though upon his election to the see of Aghadoe he had procured a divorce to be pronounced, *per episcopum Tybruinensem*, yet that he presumed publicly to retain the woman still, and, *quod orribile est auditu*, was living a life of incest with his own blood relations as well as some nuns; that he had wasted the goods of the Church upon them, and upon his illegitimate children; that, not satisfied with this, he had pronounced certain legitimate marriages uncanonical; that he had converted to his own use money collected for the crusade, with damnable presumption, and had

committed divers other enormous crimes. What became of the inquiry we are not told. And this record, like many others, is left to tell its own story, and for the reader to conjecture how the transaction ended. It is probable M. Theiner is not to blame for this. In the scarcity of early records, it is hardly perhaps likely that many communications from Ireland were preserved; nor, indeed, is it certain that any were sent; for the results of many of these investigations were no doubt represented to the Pope *vivâ voce* by those whom he had commissioned to inquire into them. We know no more of the case, except that three years later, in 1248, the same pope directs the Archbishop of Tuam to accept the resignation of the Bishop of Aghadoe. We have no means of knowing, but we suppose it is the same person who resigns, on the score of being so old that he is unable to perform his episcopal duties. We may here notice that within a few years from this time there occur several episcopal resignations, made on the same ground of old age, blindness being in two or three cases specified as an additional hindrance to the performance of episcopal functions. In one instance we find a Bishop of Cloyne, in 1289, resigning because he had been deprived of sight by certain enemies, who are spoken of as sons of perdition.

The next important inquiry we come to is in the year 1302, when Boniface VIII. issues a commission to examine into the crimes charged against the Archbishop of Tuam. In this instance the accusation includes simoniacal dealings with church preferments, contempt of the papal authority, consorting with murderers of the clergy, himself being at the time excommunicated; and, amongst other things, a charge that he had imprisoned and tortured a canon because he would not permit a horse belonging to the archbishop to be put up in a place where the Holy Eucharist was reserved, and that he had extorted an oath from him that he never would reveal the affair to any one. The misdemeanours of Irish bishops seem pretty equally distributed over the sees episcopal and archiepiscopal. Just twenty years after the last inquiry, another is instituted by John XXII. upon the Archbishop of Armagh. In this case the commission is directed to the Bishops of Meath, Down, and Cloyne, who were to exercise the authority of the archbishop in his diocese during the time of his citation to Rome. This accusation, like the last, implies that the archbishop had incurred the sentence of excommunication, and yet had presumed to exercise his archiepiscopal functions, and had, moreover, attacked and wounded one priest, and beaten another till the blood flowed from him in copious streams; that he had purloined the gold and silver plate and vestments from the treasury of the cathedral; that he had allowed

the cathedral and other churches of his diocese to remain so neglected that they were converted into mere barns, where provisions, and vessels, and other implements were stored away, and were even used for this purpose by thieves and robbers; that, owing to his negligence, blood was shed within the churches of his diocese; that adultery and incest were commonly committed, and that he, from ignorance of the Irish tongue, was unable to remonstrate with the perpetrators of these atrocities. Moreover, the charge of incontinency is laid at his door, and the accusation is particularized by the addition of the names of two parties with whom he had been guilty of fornication, and by whom he was said to be the father of two sons. The indictment is completed by the allegation of perjury and simony; and the three bishops, or one of them, at least, is enjoined to administer the affairs of the province, both during the inquiry and till further instructions shall come from the sovereign pontiff.

There is another case, of which the same pope had to take cognizance in 1327, which is worth recording, as it furnishes some additional information as to the rude and savage manners of the period. We can only judge of the affair from the terms of the pope's commission; but though we cannot decide upon the rights of the case, the document at least indicates a state of society which, however Irish it may be thought, is not precisely similar to what would happen in the present day.

A dispute arose between Nicolas de Wyterol and Stephen Tirel for the place and dignity of abbot of the monastery of S. Thomas the Martyr, near Dublin. The former had been appointed by the pope upon the resignation of his predecessor. The latter had, however, managed to obtain possession, so it is asserted, by simoniacal measures, and had got himself confirmed by the archbishop of the diocese; had secured the person of his rival, and had him imprisoned and fed on bread and water during the space of six months, until the poor ex-abbot nearly died with hunger and ill-treatment, and was forced against his will to tender his resignation to the archbishop of the province. The abbot in possession, not content with this, and thinking to make possession doubly sure, still kept his rival in prison, and procured a repetition of the process of his election and confirmation to the abbey to be made. Upon the arrival of a new primate of Ireland, Nicolas de Wyterol managed to escape from his dungeon, and was on his way to present his case to the Archbishop of Armagh, when Stephen Tirel lay in wait, with an armed band of men, and took bodily possession of him. Upon this the injured party appealed to the Pope; the abbot in possession got hold of the appeal and tore it in pieces, and then proceeded to incarcerate his unfortunate opponent again,

after having inflicted such personal injuries on him that his life was, at the time of the appeal being made, in imminent danger.

There was, perhaps, not a single pontiff who sat in S. Peter's chair to whose lot it did not fall to decide some such case as the last two or three which we have given in detail. We can, of course, in the space of a short article like the present, find room only for the more prominent instances of ecclesiastical criminality.

In 1347 we have another appeal from the Bishop of Ossory to the pope, the reply to which is the absolution of the suffragan bishop from the sentence of excommunication inflicted on him by his superior. The bishop alleges in his complaint that the archbishop's people would have killed him if he had not been forcibly taken from their grasp. Fortunately, in this one instance, we have two documents relating to the same subject. In the second of these we are told that the dispute between the archbishop and the bishop arose upon the former's interfering with his suffragan's trying a case of heresy, and protecting the alleged heretic, liberating him from prison, and afterwards citing the bishop to appear before him. Upon the bishop's appeal to the pope on the ground that the place of trial was not safe for him, as he feared the archbishop's people would murder him, and, endeavouring to carry the appeal to Rome, the archbishop ordered all the ports of the kingdom to be guarded to prevent his sailing. The pope summoned the archbishop to Rome, and, upon his not appearing, committed the case to the Archbishop of Cashel and the Elect of Armagh. What was the issue we are not told.

The next case of the kind belongs to the pontificate of Innocent VI. And here the facts of the case we may presume to have been probable; for the document contains a mandate from the Pope to restore the injured prior to his rights, and to inflict condign punishment on the perpetrators of the outrages, if they were shown to be true. The atrocity of the case, though not beyond precedent, serves to illustrate Irish customs of the fourteenth century. The prior of Instiok (?) had complained that about a dozen laymen of the diocese of Ossory had attacked the prior and canons with an armed band, had wounded the prior, killed one of the canons, and had dug out the eyes and cut out the tongue of another, and, not content with this, had, in conjunction with the Bishop of Ossory, compelled him to tender his resignation. This is the story as far as we can construe the Latin. But it is plain that M. Theiner has in this instance, as in almost every other that he has examined, paid no attention to accuracy in the printing of his

papers. In the present document we have to notice that the stops are placed in such a way as materially to interfere with the proper understanding of the terms of the commission, and that one important sentence appears to have been produced in an ungrammatical state, simply because M. Theiner has lengthened the contractions of the original MS. and used the wrong case of a noun. His entire ignorance of English and Irish names appears moreover here as elsewhere. The name Engloud, we do not doubt, should be spelt with *an* or *on* instead of with *ou*; and why out of eleven surnames ten are allowed to stand in their Irish character, whilst that of Arnald alone is Latinized into Arnald[us], we are at a loss to conjecture.

The next document in order of time which we shall notice, though of a different class, illustrates a similar lawless feeling pervading all ranks of people.

In 1452 Nicolas V. had appointed Michael Trigowre to the archbishopric of Dublin; the archbishop elect, for reasons which do not appear, and without permission from the holy see, procured his own consecration by the hands of the Bishop of Llandaff, who, by the way, if we may judge from the documents, ventured on a consecration single-handed, in violation of ancient rule and precedent. Upon this the pope took upon himself to send a mandate to the Chancellor of Lichfield, directing him to depose the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Llandaff from all episcopal authority, and to warn the laity of both dioceses from obeying them or in any way using their ministrations. Who the Chancellor of Lichfield was to whom the papal authority was delegated we neither ascertain from the documents themselves, nor from Le Neve, who mentions only that John Godfrey was chancellor in 1428. The offending bishop was no doubt Nicholas Ashby, who succeeded in 1440, and whose death took place, according to the Canterbury register, in October, 1458. Le Neve is unable to account for the fact that the temporalities of the see were restored to his predecessor two months before his death, but the document now before us perhaps affords a solution of the difficulty, viz. that the excommunication of the bishop for the act of wilful insubordination was soon after followed by his deposition, and the appointment of a successor during his lifetime.

It is but justice to the Church of Ireland, that we should call attention to the fact, that as time goes on, these atrocities, whether on the part of the clergy or laity, are less and less frequent. In fact, about the middle of the fifteenth century, the charges seem for the most part to change their character. Heresy begins about this time to crop up more abundantly, and whereas the accusation is occasionally added to the list of crimes



urged against the accused in earlier times, it begins to form the main portion of several charges as we approach nearer and nearer to the period of the Reformation.

Nevertheless, as late as A.D. 1463, we find the Dean of Aghadoe petitioning to be restored to his church preferments, from which he had been deposed. The dean, it appears, had made war with some kinsman of his own to recover a castle, of which he had been spoiled, and had issued ineffectual orders to his followers not to kill or mutilate any of their enemies. In the conflict, however, in which the dean himself took part, the chief offending party was taken prisoner, and two laymen of his attendants were killed. The dean alleges that he had restored his kinsman to his own friends, and entreated them to take care of him, and that upon this, peace was restored between the combatants; but that, nevertheless, the kinsmen took up arms again with the view of recovering the castle, when one of his party was killed by a friend of the dean in the dean's own presence. And the petition for restoration was urged on the ground that the dean had never intended to kill any one, and had not sanctioned any of the proceedings further than such as were necessary without bloodshed for the taking of the castle.

Accordingly the Archbishop of Tuam is directed by Pius II. to restore the dean to his preferment, if the facts alleged shall turn out to be true. The last document relating to Ireland, of the pontificate of his successor, Paul II. is indited in somewhat a higher strain. It is a peremptory direction to protect the Bishop of Cork and Cloyne against the usurpation of his predecessor's coadjutor. The pope regrets that his brother, the Archbishop of Cashel, should have favoured the intruder, and directs him instantly to dismiss him, and to instal his successor.

And now we have done with this class of documents, which refer to Irish quarrels, ecclesiastical, secular, or mixed. We have only one remark to make—viz. that if the Church of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries should seem to have admitted great scandals into its history, there was at least an attempt made to reform abuses. Whatever evil existed—and we have no wish to palliate or underrate the amount of it—it did not exist without some wholesome check being placed upon it. It was not allowed to plead for itself that it was the normal state of society in that very abnormal period.

Before we go on to notice the other remarkable documents which throw light upon Irish political or ecclesiastical affairs, we may take this opportunity of expressing our regret at the great amount of space which is absolutely thrown away in this volume. We do not allude to the ample margin of the page in which the letterpress is set up, of which we should be the last persons to

complain. What we advert to is, the number of absolutely insignificant documents that have found their way into the volume. The stores of the Vatican must be indefinite if the appointments to other inferior offices in the Church are chronicled there. And yet we suppose it must be so, as there seems no reason why one appointment to an archdeaconry or a prebendal stall should be preserved more than another. We have already complained of the great number of papers, couched in precisely the same terms, which refer to the appointment of archbishops, the investing them with the pall, and their confirmation. But our complaint further enlarges itself when we find so many instruments which merely contain the detailed instructions to institute an abbot, a prior, or a prebendary, to their respective dignities. The truth is, there is so much that is interesting, that we are dissatisfied, and want more; and are unwilling that the goodly folio pages should be occupied with so much that is mere repetition.

Probably a reader's attention would be directed next after the official documents, and those which refer to litigations, to the instances of appeal on petition in matrimonial cases. The number of these papers is very great, though it is larger in the Scottish than in the Irish division of the volume. Here, again, the cases in Scottish history are far worse than the Irish. They are more numerous, and they exhibit a much lower state of morality. There must be nearly a hundred such cases in the volume; but the most striking feature in the papers of this kind which belong to Scottish history, is, the amount of impediments to matrimony created by illicit intercourse between the sexes. It is well known to all who are acquainted with the history of the divorce of Henry VIII. and Catharine of Arragon, that the canon law makes no distinction between affinity created by lawful or unlawful connexions. Henry VIII. of course, considered, or affected to consider, that the cases were totally distinct, and forced Cranmer to believe as he did himself, or if he did not make him believe it, he forced him to write as if he did. We believe there is nothing now in existence so utterly damaging to Cranmer's character, as the volume he wrote for Henry for the purpose of proving that his affinity with Anne Boleyn, owing to his connexion with her sister, constituted no impediment, whilst the continuance in the marriage with his brother's virgin-widow was a mortal sin. This by the way.—We are concerned now to observe that Scotch petitions to the pope to ratify marriages already solemnized, or to grant a dispensation for intended marriages, are distinguished from Irish in this particular: The latter almost always specify that the man and the woman were about to marry, or had already married within the prohibited

degrees, generally the third of affinity, or the fourth of consanguinity, or both. And this is the whole of the case as far as regards most of the Irish documents. But the case is far otherwise with the Scotch petitions for allowance in such matters. They almost invariably specify, in addition to this impediment, another fault in the contract that had been made, and had been or was about to be solemnized—viz. that the man had contracted affinity with his wife by some unlawful connexion with a woman related to her within the third or fourth degree of consanguinity, thereby establishing the same degree of affinity between the contracting parties. In one instance the case is so aggravated that the man confesses a delinquency of this kind with three different relations of his wife. Now this is very significant of the state of society as regards this particular vice in Scotland. It must be remembered, that in all cases these are not people from the lower ranks of life, but from the aristocracy of the country. It gives us a melancholy picture of social life. For, of course, we cannot suppose, numerous as are the specimens printed, that these are anything but specimens of a very much larger number of cases. Moreover, it must be remembered that we must leave a considerable margin for cases where the relation of consanguinity was never found out, as well as for cases where there was no necessity for open avowal of the sin, and also for those where no dispensation would be required to meet the exigency of a marriage with a relative of one of the guilty parties. When all this is considered, the state of morals in Scotland as revealed by this volume, in and about the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, must have been perfectly frightful. We are accustomed in this day to contrast the chastity of Irish and Scotch women of the lower ranks, and everybody knows that the comparison tells greatly in favour of the Irish. People attribute this difference to the different forms of religion adopted by the two nations respectively. The confessional, it has been said, has the effect of diminishing sins of this kind to a great extent; whereas Presbyterianism has scarcely any hold over the morals of Scottish society. We have no doubt the estimate contains, upon the whole, a true view of the case. But M. Theiner's volume obliges us considerably to modify our views on this matter; and we are constrained to fall back upon national character to account for a part of this difference. We have seen how the documents we have already quoted indicate the same type of character pervading the Irish population in the fourteenth century, which still characterizes them in the middle of the nineteenth. And it is plain that Scotland, in spite of the very different faith it then possessed, was not much better than it is now. Let us hope that the greater purity of life that exists among

the upper classes of life in Scotland now, is a proof of the greater influence for good exerted by the Reformed Church of Scotland, to which this class for the most part belongs, than by the Roman Catholic communion of the fourteenth century. Before we quit Irish affairs altogether, it may be worth while to notice the curious antagonism between the people of England and of Ireland, which is another feature of permanence of character. As early as the year 1220 we have an instance of it, in the attempt made (it does not appear how) on the part of certain Englishmen to keep from preferment in the Church of England people who had been brought up in the sister island. Certain Englishmen, says the pope, with unheard-of temerity and audacity, have decreed that no Irish clerk, however well instructed and right-minded, shall be promoted to any ecclesiastical dignity in England. Honorius III. accordingly charges the legates of the holy see to see that any Irish ecclesiastics, canonically elected, whose life and learning were sufficient, were admitted freely to any positions in England. The evil must have been of some magnitude, for the same mandate is repeated almost in the same words four years afterwards.

There is one other document which illustrates this point. A few years later, in the pontificate of Innocent IV. a custom appears to have grown up of accepting the testimony of Englishmen, and undervaluing that of Irishmen. Now here again we have traces of the national failing of want of truth, existing then as it does now. If an Englishman had lost anything, and swore that an Irishman had stolen it, he was believed if he could get six Englishmen to say that they believed him; but though thirty Irishmen could be found to testify to the good character of the accused and his innocence in the particular charge, yet restoration of the property was ordered to be made, as if it had certainly been stolen. Again, on the other hand, if an Irishman had lost something, and though they certainly knew that an Englishman had stolen it, and were willing to take an oath on the subject, Englishmen refused to accept their testimony; and thus, as the pope observes, frequently a miscarriage of justice takes place, and a grave prejudice against undeserving persons is created.

We turn now to the Scottish portion of the volume, and first, as to the character of Scotch ecclesiastics. We have not to proceed far before we come, at p. 9, to an inquiry into the conduct of the Bishop of Moray, intrusted to three abbots of the diocese of S. Andrews. And here we have perhaps an element of Scottish character apparent. The principal charge is, that instead of tending the flock committed to his care, he confined himself to appropriating the fleece and the milk to his

own purposes. Instances of this conduct are particularised, such as receiving money for ordinations. As a secondary charge, we have named the spending the money so obtained, on women, with whom he is accused of consorting. The same motive of getting money is assigned as the reason of his dissolving legal marriages, and winking at illegal ones; and all this in such degree as the document states it, *ut factus sit odor mortis in mortem*. We must remind our readers not hastily to come to the conclusion that either in this case or in those that followed the charges were certainly proved. Most of the letters refer only to an investigation into the truth of the facts alleged, and we know no more of them. The next case arises only a few years later in the same pontificate. It is an inquiry of a precisely similar nature into the conduct of the Bishop of Glasgow, who was accused of having bought his promotion to the episcopate by a present of one hundred marks to the king's chamberlain, and the promise of a much larger sum to the queen in the event of his being appointed. To this accusation were added several other charges of simoniacal appointments, and of general neglect of his diocese. This is one of the few cases in which impurity of life is not alleged, though it is urged against him that he connived at the adulterous intercourse of persons of his own house with the wives of strangers.

Again, we repeat, the charges are in scarcely any case proved in the volume, and are for the most part, at this distance of time, not either able to be disproved or substantiated. But the frequency of the charge, and the similarity of the mode of sin mentioned, sufficiently prove that such things were neither very uncommon, nor thought very unlikely to be true.

The next atrocity we come to during the pontificate of Honorius III. is not perpetrated by ecclesiastics, but against them. The document is a breve addressed to four Scottish bishops, directing them to punish severely the murderers of the Bishop of Caithness. The breve details the circumstances, which were the following: A dispute arose between the bishop and his parishioners (we suppose bishops in Scotland at that time held parochial cures much in the same way as they do now) as to the payment of tithes and other dues to the Church. The dispute had apparently been adjusted in the presence of the king, by certain mediators, to the satisfaction of all the parties. The bishop went home, and the king set out on his road to England on important business, when these satellites of the devil made an attack upon their bishop, stopped, beat, and stoned him, and after nearly killing him with a battle-axe, then burnt him alive in his own kitchen. Upon hearing of this, the king returned, and determined to execute due vengeance on the perpetrators of so

cruel a deed of blood. Accordingly, the pope takes the opportunity of complimenting the king on his zeal for the Church, and signifies his approval of the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the four bishops, adding the punishment of placing all the lands of the murderers, if they are in possession of any, under an interdict. The story sounds barbarous, but the date must not be forgotten. It occurred in A.D. 1222.

No doubt one of the commonest cases of complaint was when a bishop or abbot alienated the goods of his bishopric or monastery for the purpose of enriching his relations. One such instance occurs in the thirteenth century, under the popedom of Nicolas IV. regarding the celebrated Benedictine Abbey of Arbroath, or Aberbrothick. There is nothing, however, particularly worth noticing, except that the abbot is not charged generally with all the other crimes human nature can be guilty of. And we have selected this instance in preference to others, merely in order to illustrate the excessive carelessness with which M. Theiner has edited the volume. No doubt Scotch names, especially when spelt in so very different a style from that in which they were commonly pronounced, must have presented great difficulties to Italian scribes, especially as the variations of spelling in the petition or appeal as it originally came from Scotland, were perhaps many. But the editor had only to look through his own volume to extract a tolerably fair average spelling. In this particular document the spelling is Avirbrech. We are not surprised at any amount of misspelling of such a name in the original document. Arbroath was one of the most celebrated religious establishments north of the Tweed; and it is alluded to in this volume perhaps nearly fifty times, though the very defective index at the end of the volume specifies only six places in which it is mentioned. But there is something absolutely ridiculous in M. Theiner's suggesting, as he does, in the heading of the document No. CCCXXXVIII. Aberbrochot for Avirbrech. We believe in the different papers referring to it in this volume, there are as many as a dozen different spellings of the word, all more or less of an approximation to the usual spelling. Thus we have the abbey under the name of Aberbrodic, Aberbrothot, Aberbrother, Aberbowothot, Abbebroth, Aberbroth, Arbirbrocht, Abirbroth, but there is no instance of the spelling which the editor suggests. It is not till he gets near the end of his volume that M. Theiner seems to begin to guess at the right spelling of the name. An Englishman may be pardoned for feeling some exasperation at the extremely defective style in which this volume has been produced, particularly when he can refer with such reasonable satisfaction to the mode in which State Papers and Calendars are being produced in this country.



We proceed to give a few more specimens of papers illustrative of the history of Scotland. No. DCCCXLIII. contains a permission from Paul II. in 1469, for a Canon of the Premonstratensian Abbey of Sarcinemus, whatever that Latin appellation may mean, to appoint another priest to serve a parochial charge for him for the remainder of his life, on the ground that he had lost his sight, and was afflicted with leprosy. It seems a simple matter to apply to the pope about, but probably the monks of a Premonstratensian Abbey would decline any jurisdiction except that of their own abbot, and we suppose, from this document, his power did not extend so far as to allow of the appointment of a curate, as we should now call it, in full charge, and removable at pleasure.

No. DCCCXLVII. is also a remarkable document. It contains the exemption of the collegiate Church of S. Giles, in Edinburgh, from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of S. Andrew's. The bull states, that at the request of the king, the provost, the baillies, sheriffs, and others, this grant was made, and thus this church and all belonging to it was taken under the immediate cognizance of the Pope.

The pontificate of Sixtus IV. which began in 1471, introduces us to a new and very interesting class of documents. It is well known that from very early times there had been a claim set up by the Archbishops of York, to exercise jurisdiction over the Scottish bishops as their suffragans. One of the first acts of Sixtus, was to erect the see of S. Andrew's into an archbishopric, and to give the bishop of that time the state and dignity of archbishop and metropolitan of Scotland. The preamble of the bull is a little remarkable, and shall be inserted here as a specimen of the style adopted by Sixtus. It is as follows: we have corrected some misprints, and modernized the spelling of a few Latin words:—

'SIXTUS EPISCOPUS, etc.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Triumphans pastor æternus, gloriosa sanctorum traditione patrum, ut suum salvaret populum, decretis in monte colloquiis eruditionis sanctissimæ, inter alia mysteria promisit, quod ignis in altari sacerdotis confoveretur officio, et ut sine intermissione combureret, ligna ei subicere illius non cessaret ministerium studiosum. Altare quippe Dei cor fidelis habetur cujuslibet, in quo ipsius ardor ignis indesinenter expetitur quo velut flamma ardentis incendatur caritatis: sancta vero et immaculata, quam pastor ipse, adveniente temporis plenitudine ejus unigeniti gloriosissimi aspersione sanguinis fundari, consecrari et æternabiliter stabiliri censuit, ecclesia, ignis ejusdem sacri flaminis splendore vestita, quos regeneravit in Christo ipsius caritatis nexu, et compage fideles stringit universos, et ecclesias alias suas tanquam adolescentulas ignis ejusdem confovet ardoribus, et scintillis adornat caritatis. Nos itaque illius summi directione pastoris, qui ecclesiæ et fidelium eorundem, nostræ commisit insufficientiæ curam, nosque licet immeritis, in ipsius montis verticem ad summum

sacerdotis pontificium conscendere voluit, hujusmodi instructi documentis easdem ecclesias earumque pastores in partem sollicitudinis concilii celestis dispositione vocatos, in caritatis visceribus ardentius complectentes, nostros continue diffundimus cogitatus ut ea summopere nostri ministerii dona congeramus per quæ ecclesiarum earundem, et illis præsentium prælatorum occurratur dispendiis, et necessitatibus provideatur accommode, ipsæque ecclesiæ invicem caritatis nexu conjunctæ, votivæ prosperitatis incrementa suscipiant."

The rest of the bull it is unnecessary to transcribe, being in the usual form of such documents. The most curious portion of it is the complete ignoring on the part of the pope of the claims of the Archbishop of York. Nothing could sound more reasonable than the provisions made in it, and the reasons assigned for such provisions. The number of cathedrals, the distance from Rome, the want of a metropolitan to appeal to, the existence of frequent cases of appeal, and the extreme difficulty of bringing them directly to the Roman courts, seem conclusive arguments for making an archiepiscopal see to remedy these great inconveniences. And if we had known nothing of the jurisdiction which appears, certainly occasionally at least to have been conceded to the see of York, and which was even urged half a century afterwards as a reason why the archbishopric of S. Andrews should be discontinued, there would have been nothing surprising in such a bull emanating from any pope. There had been a previous inquiry on the subject entered into. The pope had been duly informed of everything that it was necessary for him to know, and he had reasonably fixed on S. Andrew's, as a large and important diocese which contained the principal city, where the king and his predecessors had most commonly held their court. The suffragan sees were all quoted by name, and subjected to the newly-constituted authority of the metropolitan see. They are enumerated as follows: Glasgow, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Moray, Brechin, Dumblane, Ross, Caithness, Galloway and Lismore, Sodor or the Isles, and Orkney. A considerable number of the printed collection of papers relating to this pontificate, belong to matters which are connected with the new archdiocese and province, which latter extended over the whole kingdom of Scotland. The appointment does not appear to have been popular. In the very next year the Bishop of Aberdeen is exempted from the authority of the archbishop's see. The old bishop did not like the new régime, and appealed to Rome, and was backed by the king. This appeal gave the pope the opportunity of stating in his reply, that the church of Aberdeen had been from its very first institution subject immediately to the see of Rome, *nullo medio subjecta*. About four years afterwards an inquiry was set on foot as to the character of the newly created archbishop, Patrick, who was accused of

irregularity, simony, blasphemy, scandal, and other great and enormous crimes. The charge seems to have been brought against the archbishop by the king, the cathedral chapter, and the clergy generally, as well as the university and the laity. Whatever were the rights of the case, it issued in the deposition of the archbishop. His successor, William, does not seem to have succeeded much better with his suffragans; or perhaps the Scottish spirit of insubordination, which afterwards exhibited itself in hatred of prelacy, here took the form of opposing the distinction that had been introduced into the ranks of the prelates, for upon a quarrel arising between the Bishop of Glasgow and the metropolitan, the former is exempted from his jurisdiction, and placed immediately under the pope, as the Bishop of Aberdeen had previously been. Shortly afterwards, the same pontiff, Innocent VIII. summoned the Archbishop of S. Andrew's to Rome, probably for the sake of consulting with him and arranging for the new archbishopric of Glasgow, though this is not expressed in the letter itself. However this may be, in 1490, Glasgow was made an archbishopric, and the bishops of Dunkeld, Dumblane, Galloway and Lismore, were subjected to the see as suffragans. The instrument, however, distinctly specifies that the erection of the dignity was only for the lifetime of the present possessor of the see. And we regret that M. Theiner has not printed, what must have issued from Rome; some documents which continued this dignity to the successors of the existing Bishop of Glasgow; for, as far as we know, historians have not taken note of the fact that the creation was at first only temporary.

Before we go on to notice the last hundred pages of this volume, which refer to the period when the Reformation was commencing, there is one other document to which we will draw the attention of our readers. We much regret that it is unique. There must be several papers in the Vatican which more or less resemble it in kind, and we should have been glad to have seen other specimens of a process which is but little familiar to English historians. There are few parts of the Roman system that have been more unjustly criticized than the method of canonization. Protestants, in general, start with the supposition that miracles, after a certain period, variously fixed according to the historical knowledge of the person who makes the supposition, are absolutely impossible. Such persons agree only in one point, that for several centuries past no such things have occurred, and that it would be ridiculous to entertain the idea at all, or to attempt to investigate the evidence of an alleged modern miracle. The recent theory that a miracle is in itself a mere impossibility, is, to a certain extent, more philosophical;

for it does not attempt to ignore facts which are testified by the evidence of the senses. The want of philosophy in such persons is not so much in the theory they adopt, which if there were no other sciences in the world than those called physical we should be unable to object to. The gross absurdity of which such persons are guilty is, that they cannot or will not go the length of giving up Christianity, which is a simple necessity of logic. Such persons shut their eyes to reason. But Protestants close their eyes against facts. And, as we have said, they fix the period at which miracles in general ceased, earlier or later, according to the amount of their acquaintance with ecclesiastical history. Thus, though they all agree that no such things take place now, they disagree about the line of demarcation which is to be drawn separating the miraculous from the ordinary portion of ecclesiastical history. The tendency of the day, no doubt under the irresistible influence of testimony, is to lengthen the period during which miracles may be admitted as genuine. It is within our own recollection that a Regius Professor of Divinity laid down the convenient limit that miracles ceased about the time of the death of the last person who had seen an Apostle. Undoubtedly it was a more convenient than philosophical separation. We are far from supposing that the respected Dr. Burton himself believed in the exact truth of his own view. We believe we do him no injustice in saying that he would have been content to allow of differences of opinion on the point, but we think he laid down his line as a convenient mark, a kind of *via media* between believing too much and too little, which was, above all other things, the characteristic of the orthodoxy of the High Church Divines of the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. Dr. Burton's reading was mostly of the first three centuries, as is evidenced from the number of his publications relating to that time. We believe, indeed, that he published no theological work which referred to anything subsequent to the Council of Nice. Consequently it had not come in his way to examine the evidence for the miracles of the fourth and fifth centuries. Had he lived longer, we have no doubt he would cautiously have admitted the probability of some of these miracles, though it would be too much to expect that even he would have been altogether free from a prejudice against the evidence for modern miracles. It is undeniably for the interests of Protestants to deny them. They admit that they do not occur in their system, and it would be a heavy blow to them to be obliged to allow that within the limits of the Roman Communion true miracles occurred. It is a matter of life and death. Their all is staked on representing Rome as Antichrist, and to maintain their position it would be necessary

for them to attribute miraculous agency in Rome, if distinctly proved, to the evil one.

The position of the Church of England is, of course, very different. For ourselves we do not scruple to avow our belief in the possibility of miracles as such, and we would express our strong conviction that they still occur. We believe it to be simply impossible to resist the evidence for certain alleged miracles of our own times, and if such things are rarely vouchsafed in our own Communion, and if the evidence for them is slight and confined within a narrow circle, we say that it is just what might be expected in a country and in an age where there is so little faith.

But we have made a digression, almost without informing our readers what is the purpose of it. The remarks which we have made then have been provoked by reading a document in M. Theiner's volume, which relates to the canonization of Queen Margaret of Scotland. We have said that it is unique, and we will proceed to give a brief analysis of it.

Unfortunately the document is not only unique, that is to say, it is the only one of its kind to be found in these pages, but it is entirely isolated. We mean that there is no other document preceding or following it which throws any light upon its contents. Its date is the only thing from which we can learn anything about it as a piece of history. Our first impression was that the Queen Margaret must of necessity be the queen of Malcolm the Third of the twelfth century, who is the only Scottish queen of that name that we know of as having been canonized. But upon turning to Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, it was found impossible to adjust the circumstances. The earlier queen had been canonized by an earlier pope; and we confess that we were at first baffled, for it did not occur to us to adopt the alternative that the process of investigation had failed to establish the claims of Queen Margaret to a place in the Christian calendar. Yet this is the supposition that alone accounts for all the facts. Pope Sixtus IV. had in the usual way sent commissioners to inquire. The inquiry must have failed, for there is no other Queen Margaret besides the queen of Malcolm who occupies a place amongst the saints. In the case before us, at least, Rome did not strain a point to get things recognised as miraculous which were ordinary occurrences of nature, nor for the sake of pleasing princes, nobles, or people, was she easy in raising the virtue and the piety of a queen to the rank of sanctity.

The document to which we have been referring is No. DCCCLXXXIII. at page 499, and is headed—

*'Judicibus, ut de vitâ, moribus, morte et miraculis Margaritæ*

'*quondam reginæ Scotiæ se informant et referant.*' Reg. Secret. Tom. I. fol. 515.

It consists of a commission from Pope Innocent VIII. to his venerable brothers, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and the Bishop of Glasgow, and to his beloved sons the Elect of Aberdeen and the abbot of the monastery of St. Cross in the archiepiscopal diocese. The preamble contains, 'That the Heavenly King may kindle in the hearts of the faithful the love of Himself, and may convert the unbelievers to the true faith he daily magnifies, and adorn his saints with glorious and unnumbered miracles. For the faithful are rendered more devout towards the Most High by seeing His elect after their happy departure from this life shine forth illustrious for their virtues.' The document goes on to state that the pope had received a petition from his most dearly beloved son in Christ, James King of Scotland, alleging that Margaret, formerly Queen of Scotland, during her lifetime had lived piously, teaching the way of salvation, alike by precept and example, and had happily reached the end of her mortal course; that subsequently to her death the Most High had honoured her memory by many miracles, which were due, as the pious devotion of the faithful firmly believed, to her merits and intercession. The petition further alleges that a very large multitude of the faithful in the realm of Scotland firmly believed and asserted their conviction that the soul of the queen had been received amongst the saints, and venerated her name and her memory; and that as she had been already numbered among the saints by the Most High, so she ought to be inserted in the catalogue of the saints in the Church militant. Upon this allegation the pope states that he had been requested on the part of the king and nearly all the prelates and nobles of the land, and had been moved by the opinion entertained on the merits and miracles of the queen, and by the supplications of an immense multitude of the faithful, grounded upon them, to grant the following commission, and to provide for the insertion of the queen's name in the catalogue of the saints, if the requisite testimonies could be obtained to the sanctity of her life and the reality of the miracles performed.

Accordingly, the pope taking into consideration that it was unbecoming that one whose sanctity was testified to alike by her merits and by miracles should remain unknown amongst men, seeing also that he had no personal knowledge of the particulars of the case, and having no objection to carry on a process summarily when the grounds were certain, but deeming caution necessary in a doubtful case—directs the four prelates or any three or two of them, to inquire diligently into the matter



after the accustomed form, and report their proceedings to himself in proper form, signed by the hand of a notary public, and sealed with their own seals, in order to enable him to proceed, according to the accustomed form in such cases observed. At the end of the document are added the questions which the prelates are to ask of persons worthy of credit, and superior to all exception. They are as follows:—

Whether the queen was and had been always reputed a good catholic, of unblameable life and conversation, and whether she was of legitimate birth, and had been properly baptized and confirmed, and had been diligent in prayer and meditation. Whether she had lived in the virgin state, or at least in chaste matrimony.

As to the nature of her good deeds, they were to inquire whether she had fed the poor, been regular at confession, and devout at the reception of the Eucharist, and had been frequent in hearing mass and at other devotions.

The next interrogations were as to her manner of dress and her mode of talking; whether she had been talkative or reserved, and whether she had ever been given to speaking idle words. Whether she had been patient under suffering and affliction, and forgiving of injuries; whether she had, as became a queen, ever preached the Word of God to the people committed to her care, or at the least had given them exhortations to the practice of virtue and obedience to the commands of God. Whether she had laboured to bring into peace and concord those that were at variance, and whether her character had at any time suffered from the charge of ill conduct in any way, and whether her whole life had been without stain of any kind. And if there were any accusers, the kind and style of the accuser was to be noticed. And lastly came the question of miracles. First, had she done any miracles during her lifetime? And if any, what and with what amount of testimony? Secondly, whether after her death she had performed any, or rather, whether Almighty God had vouchsafed miraculous cures to persons who had a particular devotion to her. The time and the circumstances of such miracles were to be minutely inquired into. Lastly, the commissioners were directed to make inquiry whether the queen had ever since the time of her death, been taken and reputed by all and especially by the inhabitants of the locality where she was buried, for an excellent woman; for how many years this reputation had lasted, and whether very many persons had been accustomed to frequent the place where she was buried, as the tomb of a saint, and one in the especial favour of the Most High; whether they still made pilgrimages thither, and made prayers to her as to a saint, and whether this practice still

continues, and whether there is any evidence of such external signs occurring on such occasions as are permitted to true and undoubted saints to perform. The date of the document which is 4 Non. Jun. 1487, makes it probable that the lady alluded to was the princess of Denmark, who died some time in the preceding year. It is evident from the absence of the names of the archbishop, bishop, and abbots whose titles are mentioned in the commission, that the Pope was, as indeed he himself professes, profoundly ignorant of the affairs of Scotland, an ignorance which is further exhibited by the interrogation as to the number of years since the death of the queen that her tomb had been frequented by the faithful.

As we have above said, the inquiry seems to have failed to establish the case, for in no catalogue of the saints does there occur the name of Margaret, wife of James King of Scotland.

As we have stated above, the character of this volume abruptly changes at the commencement of the pontificate of Leo X. and the reign of Henry VIII. Ireland and Scotland are comparatively neglected for the sake of inserting documents connected with the history of England. Nor is this the only alteration of method adopted by the editor. Whereas the earlier part of the volume contains scarcely any letters except those that are issued from Rome, the larger part of this latter portion is filled with letters addressed to the Pope. The editor himself seems to have noticed this difference, for down to the time of Leo X. the headings which separate the documents belonging to one Pontificate from those of another are *Epistolæ Calixti PP. III. &c.* For the heading of the papers of Leo the Tenth's time and the subsequent popes, we have very properly *Pontificatûs Leonis PP. X. &c.* But the author or his scribe has forgotten this in the Arguments, where the heading again wrongly recurs to the form *Epistolæ Clementis PP. VII.* The matter would have been hardly worth noticing, but it is an instance of carelessness which makes one feel that probably the same inattention has extended itself to the selection of papers to be printed. And glad as we are to see this volume, it is impossible to help feeling how much more valuable a boon M. Theiner might have offered to students of English and Irish Ecclesiastical History if he had possessed a little more knowledge of his subject, and had exercised a somewhat wiser discrimination in the selection made from the stores at his command. We promised our readers that we should grumble at intervals, and the opportunities might have been made much more frequent if we had not dealt very leniently with our editor.

And now we proceed to a much more agreeable portion of the task we have undertaken. The interest which attaches to the

papers relating to the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries is entirely eclipsed by the superior value of those of the first half of the sixteenth century. Wherever we place the line which separates mediæval from modern history, no one will place it later than the commencement of the pontificate of Leo X. or the reign of Henry VIII. The change is indicated by the very nature of the papers printed in this volume. The last of the former series bears the date of 1496, A.D. The first of the new set is of the year 1513. During the former period the volume indicates that few letters had reached the court of Rome which were thought worth preserving. We are left to conjecture as to the nature of the communications that passed, whether *vivâ voce*, or in black and white, from the single document referring to each subject which we find printed here. We can supplement the reader's knowledge of the subject, to a very small extent, by referring to extant histories of the period. But from this point forwards we begin to be introduced to familiar names and well-known transactions. Luther and the Reformation; Henry and his title of Defender of the Faith; Wolsey, in all his glory, swaying the destinies of Europe; the policy of Clement VII.; the secret history of that divorce which was almost the sole cause of the English Reformation, to say nothing of a hundred other subjects of minor importance, are here illustrated from originals which have for the most part never till now seen the daylight. We say for the most part, because there are a few which have appeared in print, and a few more which exist in MS. copies. Perhaps some persons may be surprised to learn that there are any copies of such documents existing. And a few words of explanation as to this point may be acceptable. And first we may observe, that of important political or historical papers there exist frequently two or three different copies, which all have some claim to be called originals. Suppose, for instance, that the King of England writes a request to the pope to make one of his bishops a cardinal, a very common occurrence in the first half of the reign of Henry VIII. There would first of all be a rough draft of the letter, written in the hand of Ammonius, or Peter Vannes, or any one else who might for the time being be performing the functions of a secretary for the Latin tongue. Such drafts have in many cases been preserved, and they are occasionally of importance, as indicating by the changes or interlineations the trouble that was taken with the composition, or even the alteration of circumstances which occurred between the writing of the draft and the sending off of the finished composition. Such papers as these latter are of the utmost historical importance, for they give us a view of the real mind of the writer; and how he was influenced in what he said by

passing events, and steered his course accordingly. Of course, instances of this are rare, and we only notice them by the way. The existence of drafts however is very common, some thousands perhaps being at present in the Record Office Collections, and in the Cottonian and other libraries in the British Museum. The value of these drafts, moreover, is very considerable in some cases where the perfected letter has been lost, and in others where it was never sent. In such cases as these last, they are the sole originals. In other cases they represent the rough copies of what were afterwards polished, and were either written or at least signed by the person by or for whom they are written. The copy which is signed and endorsed with the address of the person to whom it is written has of course the best right to be called the original document. However, we have not yet exhausted the number of claimants to this title. In many cases, a copy of this original was made, either under the direction of the person that wrote it, or else was transcribed by his own hand, and preserved as a record. In all important transactions this was done, though it is not so often that duplicates of this kind are found as might be expected. Again, in some cases the recipient of the letter would copy it or cause it to be copied, and in case of damage to, or loss of the original, such a MS. copy frequently becomes of considerable value; though, of course, in no sense can this be called an original. We are speaking now of documents which are written so as for any person to be able to read them. There are no cyphered despatches in M. Theiner's volume, so at present we need not say anything of that class of papers.

It will now be understood how it is that M. Theiner's documents have in some few cases been anticipated, both in MS. and in print. A few of them are to be found in what was once the State Paper Collection, but which has now been transferred to the Record Office. A very few, perhaps, may be seen in the Cotton Library, and a few more are amongst the Vatican transcripts. It is some of these latter transcripts which enable us in part to form so unfavourable an estimate of M. Theiner's mode of executing his editorial task. The Vatican transcripts are of course mere copies from the identical MSS. from which M. Theiner has printed his collection. A comparison of the two therefore enables us, without having seen the originals themselves, to pronounce upon the respective merits of the copyists. Where they agree, there is scarcely room for the supposition of error; where they differ it is not very difficult to ascertain which is right and which is wrong. Indeed, before the publication of the '*Monumenta Vaticana*,' we had formed our own opinions as to the fidelity of the transcripts, some of which have been accurately printed in the Foreign Series of State Papers

of Henry VIII. And undoubtedly they furnish considerable evidence of the inefficiency of the amanuensis and editorial staff engaged in this volume. But enough of fault-finding. We proceed to the correspondence itself.

This latter portion of the volume ranges over the whole period during which Leo X., Adrian VI., Clement VII., and Paul III. sat in S. Peter's chair. And we purpose to give some account of such papers as have not yet appeared in print. As we have already said, there are no papers of the reign earlier than 1513. We can offer no conjecture as to the reason for the omission of the first few years, whether the computation is made from Henry's or Leo's accession. The omission of seventeen years we cannot help thinking is another instance of great carelessness. By far the most interesting letter of the year 1513 is that in which the king announces from Tournay, on the 12th of October, the victory his troops had lately gained over the Scots at Flodden Field. The facts as stated by the king it must be remembered are not strictly historical. The letter conveys the impression made on Henry's mind, for he had not yet learned to tell lies systematically, nor was anything to be gained at this period of his reign or at this particular juncture by doing so. However, what he tells the pope is, that 'Never was the mercy of God more conspicuously shown than by this victory which the Earl of Surrey had gained over the Scots, with almost no loss of any consequence to his men, and with the loss of 13,000 Scots, including their king and the whole of their nobility.' The king had written a previous letter on the first announcement of the victory informing the pope about it, but now he was able to detail the whole story, the full account of which he had written in his letters directed to the Cardinal of York and the Bishop of Worcester, his orators at the court of Rome. Perhaps we ought to apologise to our readers for reminding them that the Cardinal of York in this instance means Bainbridge, and not Wolsey, who was only just rising to political importance. In the present letter the king confines himself to generals, and represents the King of Scotland as having most perfidiously invaded his kingdom during his absence at the instigation and by the assistance of the French king, who had aided him with money, men, and engines of war; adding, moreover, that only one Scottish nobleman survived who had asked for peace, but that he had refused all terms and meant to follow up the victory. This, however, was not the only victory which the king had to announce, for he had met with another no less important success in the siege of Tournay, which after a week had been obliged to surrender. The king adverts to the marriage which was projected between his sister Mary and the Prince of

Castile, and says that he means to start the next day, October 13th, for England, where his presence was necessary at the opening of the Parliament which had been summoned for the 1st of November. He further signified his intention of returning in the spring to prosecute his victories, meantime leaving a strong garrison for the protection of Tournay.

The last request of the letter is remarkable, and illustrates the king's ignorance of the internal affairs of the kingdom of Scotland. The Archbishop of S. Andrew's, the fourth in succession, named James Stewart, a natural son of the King of Scotland, had fallen with his father at the battle of Flodden; the king therefore begs the pope not to renew the archiepiscopal dignity of S. Andrew's, partly on the ground of the recent erection of the see to an archbishopric; this, as he alleges, being only the second archbishop in succession, and partly because the see of York had suffered so much by the loss of so many suffragan bishops as it had formerly had subjected to it in the kingdom of Scotland. He also asks for the restoration of the priory of Coldingham to the monastery of Durham, from which it had been severed in order to annex it to the archbishopric of S. Andrew's, for the sake of increasing the dignity and revenues of the see. Lastly, the king requests that as so many bishops had fallen in the battle, and so many dioceses in Scotland were therefore vacant, the pope would delay the appointments till he should have heard what the King of England's wishes on the subject were. He begs also a decent burial for the King of Scots, who had died under the sentence of excommunication. The King of England thought that it became his own dignity to provide for the decent interment of his brother of Scotland in the cathedral church of St. Paul's. He therefore asks that a breve may be addressed to the Bishop of London containing the requisite permission.

We feel when we reach the sixteenth century, as treated in this volume, that we have something like continuous history. Up to this point it is nothing but a string of discontinuous documents, many of them extremely valuable, but scarcely any two having any connexion one with another. Now the letter of the king to the pope which we have just been giving some account of, is almost the first paper which we can connect with what goes before and follows after. It is, so to say, a fortunate accident that we can from these same pages illustrate the allusion to the severance of the cell of Coldingham from the priory of Durham, and its annexation to the see of S. Andrew's. We have already seen that between forty and fifty years before, Pope Sixtus IV. had created the metropolitan see; immediately after its creation he had provided for the increase in the expenses of the establish-



ment of the new archbishop by annexing to its revenues the incomes of several parish churches and monasteries in Scotland. The process seems to have been gradual, and evidently the annexations were made at the repeated request of the new archbishop, who found himself unable to bear the expenses of his increased dignity. At first a single priory was annexed about four months after the creation of the see. Two months later a considerable number of parochial churches were annexed to the see, provision being made for the union as the lives of the incumbents dropped off in succession. Further to increase the dignity of the archbishopric, though it does not appear to have added anything to its revenues, the pope on the same day made a grant to it of several churches and monasteries which had before been exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. In the following month of April, the severance of Coldingham from Durham took place, and in the document No. DCCCLVII. which records this, we have an interesting piece of history. It appears that the priory of Coldingham, in the diocese of S. Andrew's, had been founded in remote antiquity by the kings of Scotland for a prior and eighteen monks of the Benedictine order, but that in course of time by the agreement of the two sovereigns it was united to the monastery of Durham. Here M. Theiner has twice printed *Dunclinensis ecclesia*. This it is extremely probable was an error of the scribe in the original MS. for *Dunelmensis ecclesia*, the (*e*) being easily changed into (*c*) and the (*m*) into (*in*) still more easily. We find no fault with him for following his MS. exactly, if indeed he has done so; but he might in this instance have favoured us with a (*sic*) to indicate first that it was a mistake; secondly, that he had recognised the mistake. We admit that we have some misgiving as to whether it was recognised. Certainly we are unable to find an excuse for the heading of the document, where the mistaken spelling is adopted by the editor. We are driven to the supposition either that M. Theiner was ignorant of the existence of so insignificant a city as Durham, or that he supposed *Dunelmensis* was sometimes spelt *Dunclinensis*. The paucity of words in the index, in which neither *Dunelmensis* nor *Dunclinensis* occurs, does not enable us to solve this difficulty. The union appears to have been effected on the ground that the number of monks had been reduced to two, and the severance on the ground that the friar, John Pincher, and his monks, one or more of them, had been guilty of grave offences against the king, for which the prior was removed and a revocation of the annexation granted by which Coldingham was restored to its ancient state, and a new prior appointed. This revocation had been granted by Pius II. and unfortunately the process has been altogether omitted, important as such a process must have been as bearing on the

relations political and ecclesiastical of the two kingdoms. However, we must be content without it, and gather what we can from the reference to the transaction made by his successor, Sixtus IV. in 1473. This document informs us that at the request of James, King of Scotland, Coldingham was made a royal chapel, with a Dean and Canons, a suitable remuneration being provided out of the revenues for the Archbishop of S. Andrew's: and this seems to be the only sense as far as we can gather in which it was united to the see. The right of presentation to Coldingham was, however, vested in the King of Scotland, and it is not improbable that this was the privilege which the King of England was most anxious to secure, probably being all the while in ignorance that his predecessors had never enjoyed or exercised the right of presentation to it.

We have allowed more space than we intended to the illustration of this letter of the king's; we have one word more to say about it. So interesting a letter ought to have been followed by the pope's reply; but no such document is to be found in M. Theiner's pages. The reader is naturally anxious to know what Leo X. said in answer to all these requests, partly as a matter of curiosity, and partly to gain some light as to the relations of the Scottish and English Churches at the time of the Reformation. That there was such a reply he would naturally gather from the importance of the requests preferred in the letter, and probably he would infer from the non-appearance of any such document that no copy of it had accidentally been preserved at the Vatican. Knowing what we now do of the perfunctory style in which the whole of this correspondence has been produced, we should have hesitated before arriving at the same conclusion. And, indeed, the conclusion would have been erroneous; for not only did the pope write a reply to the king, but a copy of that reply is no doubt amongst the Vatican records, for the original itself is now in the British Museum. We regret to say that the answer is very disappointing. It is precise enough as regards the permission to bury the King of Scotland in consecrated ground, because of the possibility of his having repented of his conduct before his death; but Leo X. was too great a diplomatist to enter into an argument with the king upon the right of the see of York to exercise dominion over the suffragan sees of Scotland. Possibly he had already learned something of Wolsey's extraordinary powers, and knew that the future Cardinal of York was in attendance on his royal master at the siege of Tournay. Accordingly, not one word does the letter contain on the subject of filling the Scottish sees, nor a single allusion to the disputed point of jurisdiction. Leo X. meant to appoint another Archbishop of S. Andrew's,

and he did appoint him. He also meant to keep on good terms with Henry and his rising favourite; and he acted accordingly. We hear nothing more of the suppression of the metropolitan see of Scotland; but not much more than a year afterwards we find Henry petitioning Leo, that Gawin Douglas, the nominee of his dear sister the Queen of Scotland, might be appointed to the vacant see, according to the ancient custom of allowance on the parts of the popes his predecessors that the sovereign of the country for the time being shall nominate the metropolitan. It is worth while to observe that the king did not omit to expatiate on the merits of Gawin Douglas, and to depreciate the rival candidate, the Bishop of Moray, who the king alleged he was sure would never be acquiesced in as archbishop. This took place in 1515, but M. Theiner places it in 1514. From this period forward the interest of these pages is intense. Not only do the documents continually refer to well-known characters and events in history, but many of them throw considerable light upon doubtful points, and especially do they serve to illustrate the course of events as regards the relations of Rome and England. Here we have the king's first request for the dignity of the cardinalate to be conferred on the Bishop of Lincoln, better known by his family name of Wolsey than by that of the see which he held for so short a time. Here again is the first appearance of Booth, Bishop of Hereford, who deserves a more extended reputation than he has yet achieved. He and his two successors, perhaps, kept the best episcopal registers in the kingdom. He was appointed by the pope on the petition of the king. The Cardinal de Medicis was appointed to inquire into his merits, and to report on the nature of the see. The document which concerns these points is singularly interesting, and serves to illustrate how completely unknown provincial towns in England were; just as many of the other letters indicate an entire ignorance on the part of the pope of Scottish and Irish cities and other localities.

The cardinal reported to the pope as follows:—

In the island of England, on the confines of the duchy of Wales, in the western part, which looks towards Ireland, stands the fortified city of Hereford, on a large river, which is called in their language *Lug*. It is not distinguished by any particular trade, or for the beauty of its edifices, but has four gates, and one principal street running east and west, near which is the cathedral church of S. Thomas, about the size of that of S. John Lateran, with a western and two side entrances, one of which is made use of by the canons. It is of the form of an oblong, built of hewn stone, with three naves, separated by

columns, and having a cylindrical roof. The choir is in the middle. Behind it is the high altar, and about the church are several smaller altars. It has a well-furnished sacristy, twenty chalices, a larger and a smaller organ. The body of S. Thomas is behind the high altar, and his festival is frequented by the neighbourhood and by strangers from a distance. There is a deanery, value unknown; and about fifteen canons, enjoying different incomes, who perform divine offices by day and by night. Two masses are chanted, and the rest are said in a low voice daily. There is a belfry, with several bells, outside the church, and the canons live in different houses in the neighbourhood, though they have a refectory in common. The palace is an old one adjoining the cathedral. The value of the bishopric is said to be about 3,000 ducats, but whence the income is derived does not appear. It is desired that a priest named Nicolas should be promoted to it, of the age of fifty-five, a favourite counsellor of the king's, a doctor of laws, of good reputation and conversation, of excellent birth, and of very fine person.

Such is the account transmitted to the Pope by the Cardinal de Medicis. We are not quite sure whether the name Nicolaus is not a mistake for Carolus; but if not, it is probable that the last half of the last sentence must be construed as applying to Booth, for whom the king's request was made, and who was actually appointed to the bishopric, though not till after the king had made three applications for him. We do not suppose M. Theiner is to blame here; but it is very vexatious to find that such a volume as this, which ought to be authoritative, can nowhere be depended on.

About the same time with this request, which was made in the correct Latinity of M. Theiner, *pro ecclesiâ Herfordensi vacante*, another person, whose name was O'Higgin, as far as we can safely gather it from the variations Quintin Ohnygyn, Ohygim, and Ohnygim, was mentioned by the king for the Irish see of Cloyne, and the investigation of this case was also committed to the Cardinal de Medicis. This appointment stood over for even a longer period than that of Booth to the see of Hereford. The date of the *Processus Consistorialis* concerning it is Nov. 9, 1516, and it is even more interesting than the inquiry into the church at Hereford, for it shows that the state of Irish cathedrals at that time will bear some comparison with the dilapidated condition which we are apt to attribute to the consequences of the Reformation. The inquiry was conducted as we have observed by the Cardinal de Medicis, and the informant in this case was Nicolas Hougan, an Irish clergyman officiating in the diocese of Hereford. Now the name here throws a little light on the previous document which concerns the see of Hereford.

Probably the cardinal himself may have confused the names of Nicolas Hougan, his informant, and Charles Booth, the subject of the information. For Nicolas Hougan being a priest of the diocese of Hereford, would be as able to give information about Charles Booth, who had been Chancellor to Henry when Prince of Wales, as, from having lived in Ireland formerly, he was able to testify to the character of his neighbour Quintin O'Higgin. However this may be, the information about the church itself is extremely interesting.

Being interrogated about the existence of the church, he replied as follows:— 'In the island of Ireland, facing towards the east 'in the province of Tuam, is the city of Cloyne, situated in the 'midst of a wood, consisting of about a dozen huts constructed 'with straw and willow twigs, on the left side of which flows a 'river, which in the language of the country is called *Sinin*. 'The city is about one day's journey from the sea. On the left 'hand facing the west is a cathedral church in ruins, without a 'roof, with a single little altar covered with straw, possessing 'only one poor altar-cloth and a cross of brass, one belfry with 'two bells, and a small sacristy, of the value of thirty-three 'ducats. The revenue is made up by corn and barley with 'which beer is made.' The cardinal, when using his own words to the pope, in reporting what the witness had told him, alters left hand into right hand, and qualifies the word *diruta*, which we have rendered *in ruins*, by the addition of the prefix *semi*-. And we must also alter our rendering to correspond to it into *dilapidated*. For the rest he adds that, 'Mass is 'rarely celebrated in it; that it holds the body of an Irish 'saint, to whom the church is dedicated.' He omits also to specify that barley is used to make beer with. Perhaps this latter omission is not to be wondered at, when we give the Latin as M. Theiner gives it. It is '*valoris triginta trium 'ducatorum qui constant ex frumento et ordeo, ex quo conficiuntur 'cervosa*.' Whether this was the expression used to the cardinal, or whether it is one of the mistakes of M. Theiner and his amanuensis, we do not know. We suspect the scribe really wrote what he ought to have written, *cerevisia* for *cervosa*. But if M. Theiner did not understand the word, he might have called attention to it by a (*sic*).

There are other descriptions of cathedral cities in Ireland, which if they had not happened to be dated, would certainly have led one to suppose that the state of things must have been of a period two or three centuries earlier. Thus the vacancy of the see of Aghadoe (*Ardakadensis*) in 1517, leads to a similar inquiry as to the locality, from which it appears that Cloyne was by no means a unique specimen of Irish cathedral

establishments. In this case Roger Omolein, a canon of Cloyne, against whose name M. Theiner volunteers the modest suggestion of Omoleyn, which mode of spelling, it may be observed, exists in another part of the document, is the bishop designate; and it does not appear, from the following description, that by his translation from Cloyne to Aghadoe he would be much of a gainer in the way of ecclesiastical propriety or comfort.

The witnesses state that the island of Hibernia, called by Pliny Juverna, is now called Ireland by the barbarians, and is about half the size of England. The part nearest to England is more civilized; the rest is occupied *ferino cultu*, their houses being built with wood and straw. A large proportion of the inhabitants herd with their cattle either in the open fields or in caverns. Scarcely any wear shoes, and nearly all are given to thieving and robbery. The country produces nothing but corn and most splendid horses, called *Ubini*, swifter than those of England, whiter also, and more gentle in their pace, which originally were bred in Spain. The island is memorable for three saints, Malachias, Cathaldus, and Patricius, who converted it to the Christian faith, and was afterwards a bishop in Scotland. It boasts also of having produced William Ocham, the celebrated logician, who flourished about A.D. 1353.

The city of Aghadoe itself is described as situated in a hilly region in the midst of woods. There are not more than four wooden huts with very poor people living in them, for the neighbourhood is in perpetual feud, especially since the time of the late bishop, who wanted to have temporal dominion over his people. This however they would not stand, and so they utterly destroyed what there was of the city, with the cathedral church, of which scarcely so much as the walls are standing. The consequence of this is easy to understand, viz. that there is but a single altar, at which mass is rarely celebrated by a single priest. There is no sacristy, no belfry or bell, and scarcely adequate implements for a Celebration. There is a deanery of the value of ten ducats, an archdeaconry valued at eight, and there are twelve canons, but only a few prebendaries with very small prebends. In spite of this dismal account, the witnesses gave the pope's commissioners to understand that affairs might yet be restored to their former state, with proper care and attention. The points in favour of Roger O'Moleyn were, that he was lawfully born of respectable parentage, sound in body and mind, well up in canon law, a priest of forty years of age, and fitted to preside over the church, and had himself made request for the promotion, asking, moreover, to be allowed still to retain his canonry at Cloyne, on the ground that the income of the bishopric was reduced to ten ducats.



Equally interesting, though of a very different character, is the account of the state of the Scottish monastery of Arbroath, which was given about the same time, when the young Earl of Moray, its commendator, wished to resign it in favour of James, Archbishop of Glasgow and Chancellor of Scotland. In this instance several witnesses are called in; we venture to conjecture that two of these who are designated respectively Michael Cunighan and Adam Sinisen, may more properly be represented under the more usual Scottish surnames of Cunningham and Simson. But M. Theiner knows nothing of Scotch names, and has not taken the trouble to get such an ordinary piece of information as may be obtained from any Scotch or English gentleman who happened to be at Rome during the time this volume was in the press. However the names are of little importance. The account of the monastery may be interesting.

It appears that Arbroath or Aberbrothick, is a Benedictine mitred abbey, in the county of Angus, dedicated to S. Thomas of Canterbury. It is on the sea and within the diocese of S. Andrew's. By it flows a small but rapid river, and a town of the same name adjoins it, with about 200 houses under the royal jurisdiction of the abbot, inhabited by husbandmen, artizans, and a few tradesmen. It was founded 350 years before by King William of Scotland, who had been a schoolfellow of S. Thomas, and had also suffered with him in England. The description of the building itself is as follows:—

It resembles the church of Santa Maria del Popolo, but is twice as large, being oblong, with a double row of pillars, nearly entirely of hewn stone of somewhat a dark colour. The floor is of the same, and a truly beautiful and royal construction it is. It has one principal western entrance, two southern doors leading to the cloister, and a northern which opens upon the burial ground. It has a nave and two aisles, a leaden covering to the roof, a square tower somewhat higher than that of S. Peter's, and a numerous set of excellent bells. On the high altar, which is very near the eastern wall, two or three masses are daily sung. Over it is a gilded canopy, containing an image of the Saviour with the world in His hand, another of S. Mary the mother of God, with the infant Jesus in her arms, also one of S. Thomas the Martyr, and of King William dedicating the church. Around the high altar is a choir of wood-work and a double row of sedilia. There are twelve other altars in twelve chapels where mass is daily said. In the sacristy, which is at the south side of the choir, there is a silver cross, a great number of chalices and other vases, with some silver statuettes of saints, a number of splendid altar-

cloths of silk and gold bullion, a pastoral staff and a mitre. At the right-hand side of the church (and here we are puzzled to determine whether right means north or south) is a large and excellent organ, and outside on the north is a cemetery surrounded by a low wall. On the opposite or southern side is a cloister or dwelling-house for the monks, of very large size, square, and surrounded with very lofty walls, containing two refectories, a dormitory and a hospital, and a library furnished with more than two hundred volumes. There are several beautiful gardens. The abbot's house, though in the same inclosure, is apart from the dwelling-place of the monks. They live however at a common table, which is supplied entirely by the abbot. Many parochial churches are under the jurisdiction of the abbey, and the abbot has the right of presentation to them, and receives tithes and other payments, and likewise certain fees from their rectors or vicars. There is a prior and a sub-prior, both removeable at the pleasure of the abbot, and forty monks, who live respectably and are assiduous in the worship of God, always saying and singing the services at their proper hours. The revenues of the abbey are not certainly known, but it is thought they amount to about 2,000 ducats a year. As regards the abbot designate, he is described as a most worthy person, of most noble birth, born in wedlock, well educated, wise and dignified, and much beloved by every one.

Perhaps some of our readers may already know that the new abbot, or commendator, as was his more general title, was the celebrated James Beaton.

Such are the valuable descriptions of Irish and Scottish churches respectively of the beginning of the sixteenth century. It must not be supposed to be a sample or specimen, for Arbroath was the wealthiest religious house in Scotland, and perhaps Cloyne and Aghadoe were the very poorest specimens of Irish cathedral establishments. Such records probably supply information not easily accessible elsewhere; we will, therefore, give two more specimens, one from each country. And first for the Irish Church.

The inquiry is made on behalf of Edmund, the old Bishop of Ross, who from his great age of more than eighty years, and great infirmities, felt himself unequal to the duties of his place, and who accordingly wishes to resign in favour of his young kinsman, abbot of S. Mary's *de fonte*, in the same diocese, with a revenue of 60 marks. The city itself, we are informed, was in the west of Ireland towards Spain! in the diocese of Cashel, on level ground near the sea. It has two hundred houses, and is surrounded by a wall which has two gates. The

land around is productive, and is especially fertile in corn. The cathedral church is in the centre of the city, dedicated to S. Fecnan, (?) whose festival coincides with the vigil of the Assumption. It is cruciform, and built of stone, about the size of the church of Santa Maria del Popolo. The entrance is by going down three steps at the west end, or at one of the sides. The roof is of wood, covered over with tiles. There is no pavement on the floor. The church consists of a nave and three aisles, and has stone pillars. The choir is in the middle, with wooden seats, at the extremity of which is a high altar, on the left-hand of which, we presume that is on the south side, is the sacristy, fairly furnished with altar cloths, crosses, chalices of silver plated with gold, a mitre, and a pastoral staff of silver. The other dignities are a deanery of 12 marks, an archdeaconry of 20, a chancellorship with 8 marks, and twelve canonries endowed with 4 each. There are also four priest vicars, who have the same income with the canons; who say the offices daily either in person or by deputy, and on festivals sing also one mass. The canons' houses are scattered about the diocese, which is small. The bishop's residence is at a distance from the city of about a mile, situated close to the sea. He has twenty-four benefices in his gift. The revenue is about 60 marks, and consists of corn, glebe, and tithes.

Our last description shall be of the Benedictine Abbey of Kelso on the Tweed. In the record it is called the monastery of S. Maria de Calco. The description would have enabled us to guess at the real name even if we had not met with the hint that in the more ordinary parlance of the nation it was called Chelso. The death of the Bishop of Caithness had caused the vacancy at the abbey, which he had held *in commendam*. The abbey appears to have been exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. It is said to have been in the west of Scotland, about fourteen miles from the sea, on the Tweed, which flows eastward into the German Ocean, and separates part of Scotland from England. It was one of the fourteen monasteries founded some four centuries previously by King David. It was not only a conventual, but also a parochial establishment with cure of souls, over whom the abbot exercised episcopal jurisdiction. The structure was of dark-coloured stone, and about the size of the church of S. Augustine at Rome. It was in the form of a double cross, with three gates at the north, west, and south sides. It had a nave and three aisles, a wooden roof covered with lead, and a floor partly paved, partly not. Of the two towers which it boasted, that at the west end had several good bells. That over the transept was shaky, and accordingly not used. The church was divided into two parts by a transverse wall; the west end was

open to the parishioners, who there heard mass, and were admitted to all the sacraments of the Church. The other part was for the monks to perform divine service in. No one was admitted excepting at times of saying the offices, and then only men; women, however, had the right of entrance on certain high festivals. Two masses were daily chanted at the high altar, which was at the east end of the wooden choir. About the church were nearly a dozen other altars, where mass was daily said both by monks and parochial clergy. On the middle wall, which divides the two ends of the church, there is an altar on which the Host is always preserved, and is the object of great reverence and devotion. This part of the church has also an organ of tin. The sacristy is on the right, evidently meaning the south side of the altar, containing a silver cross, several cups and vessels of the same metal, a mitre, a pastoral staff, and other ornaments of the priest and the altar. Close adjoining the church on the north side is the burying-ground, a square inclosure, with a low fence to keep out cattle. The cloister on the other side is also contiguous; a large square building, partly covered with lead, partly unroofed owing to the madness and impiety of enemies. It contains a chapter-house, a dormitory, a larger and a smaller refectory, and a large court with many divisions and edifices, which are resorted to both by English and Scotch strangers, and there are granaries and store-houses used both by the inhabitants and by traders to stow away their goods and merchandize when there is danger from enemies. There is a garden and good shrubbery. There are in times of peace from thirty-six to forty monks, with a superior, a prior, and an abbot, who has dominion temporal and spiritual over the town of Kelso, which contains sixty families, all agricultural and employed by the monastery, from which they receive a regular stipend for protecting it from the incursion of enemies. The monastery has jurisdiction over three or four other towns, and the abbot has the presentation to several parochial churches. This abbot, like the Commendator of Arbroath, had a house separate from the monks, but they had all a common table. The value of the place is somewhat uncertain, owing to the frequent incursions of the enemy, but may be estimated at 1,500 ducats. The advantages possessed by Thomas Ker, for whom this promotion is sought, were, that he was a tall man of thirty-six years of age, skilled in theology, considered more learned than any one in the kingdom, and had been chosen by the unanimous vote of the whole monastery, and the witness believed that the election was not only advantageous, but absolutely necessary for the good of the monastery. The witness was called James Haliburtim, if we may trust

M. Theiner. We venture to guess, that for the final (im), (un) ought to be read. And the name will then easily modernize into Haliburton.

The constant reference to enemies brings up to the recollection in a lively way the Border feuds that were so prevalent at the time in this locality between Scotch and English. These had recently been so fierce that they had frightened away the old commendator, who deemed it prudent to retire to his northern diocese of Caithness, out of the reach of enemies. And it appears that Thomas Ker had in a manner deserved the appointment, inasmuch as he had not feared, when nominated by the monks, to come into residence, living with them on equal terms, and bravely acting in defence of the abbey. The old Bishop of Caithness, it seems, wished to return when all was quiet; but, fortunately, his death put an end to the dispute.

We have spoken of the petitions for the cardinalate for Wolsey. The king had not to wait long. In September, 1515, he wrote his letter of thanks for the prompt and gracious way in which the pope had acceded to his request, having appointed the new Archbishop of York '*Novo quodam exemplo solum atque extra ordinem, tot aliis dignissimis viris præteritis.*' Wolsey had already established himself almost as the arbitrator of the affairs of Europe, and the king recognised that the young archbishop had been the means of establishing peace between France and England. Henry was as yet one of the most devoted sons of the Church, and was not likely to degenerate from the character which he had earned for orthodoxy, whilst Wolsey was his principal counsellor. There is a melancholy interest in following the correspondence, which, but for the unfortunate affair of the divorce, might probably have proceeded to the end with uninterrupted confidence between the pope and himself. We shall allude to only one more record of the pontificate of Leo X. and that is the last. It consists of a letter from Wolsey to the pope, dated May 21, 1521. The instrument which confirmed Wolsey in the legatine authority for life, ought to have been printed by M. Theiner, but perhaps it has been designedly omitted, because it has been printed elsewhere. The letter appears to be a grateful acknowledgment of the Pope's favour, and a high eulogium on Henry's orthodoxy and determination to defend the Church against Luther and all other heretics. He little knew what a different story he would have to tell if he had the prophetic gift of seeing eight or nine years in advance.

The great and increasing interest manifested in this history, together with the additional light thrown upon it by some of the documents in this volume, must plead our excuse for prolonging an article already extended beyond the ordinary limits of a

review. But to proceed methodically, we may observe that before we come to the pontificate of Clement VII. we have five letters ascribed to the time of Hadrian VI. Unfortunately for M. Theiner's credit, they are all dated from England, in February, 1523. That of course means, according to modern chronology, 1524; but M. Theiner, who knows nothing of dates 'secundum computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ,' has placed them under the pontificate of Hadrian, although they were all addressed to Pope Clement VII. There is, indeed, nothing of great importance in those letters; at the same time there is ample internal evidence to fix their dates, if there had been neither address nor date appended to them. We have nothing more to notice except that about this time the name of Andreas Ammonius, the correspondent and friend of Erasmus, disappears from the king's letters. He was now dead, and his place as Latin secretary was filled by Peter Vannes, who continues to sign the king's letters, which are written in his hand, though sometimes signed by the king's hand also, nearly to the end of the volume.

Amongst Clement's first acts was the promise to send the 'golden rose,' which afterwards arrived in the spring of 1524, by Thomas Hannibal, the king's orator at the court of Rome, who was detained by the pope for two months after his recall by the king, and who was at last very unwillingly allowed to go home.

It is here that the most provoking of M. Theiner's mistakes occurs. The private letter to the cardinal, announcing the intention to confirm the legatine power, is printed in its right place. Indeed, it would not have been easy to arrange it wrongly, as it is dated at full length, 21 January, 1524—'Pontificatûs nostro anno primo;' but who would have thought, if a moment's consideration had been given to this matter, that the cardinal's reply to the letter should be written eleven months before the letter itself was written, and should be addressed to the Pope's predecessor in the see of S. Peter? In one or two instances the editor seems to have been aware that the document must be transferred from the year in which it appears to be dated, to the following. If it were not for just one or two instances of this kind, we should really have supposed that M. Theiner had copied these documents blindly, and never had compared any two together. We suppose that M. Theiner must have read the document dated February 23, 1524, in which Henry requests the pope to accede to the request of his nephew, the king of Scotland, to promote the Abbot of Paisley to the see of Moray, and substitute in his place John Hamilton, the natural son of the Earl of Arran, aged fourteen, dispensing with the impediment of age and illegitimacy; for he has altered it, from what he must have thought



its proper place, if it had been dated correctly, and placed it among the articles of 1525. In this we should have thought he had shown some discrimination, which might have been accepted as a sort of atonement for his ignorance of the mode of dating the first three months of the year in England. But, alas! even here we are precluded from offering any defence, or making any excuse for M. Theiner, for he has placed the letter of the King of Scots, relating to the very same subject, and detailing the very same circumstances, in the previous year 1524.

It is really quite necessary to draw attention to the very extraordinary amount of ignorance and carelessness shown by M. Theiner; for unless it is distinctly proved, no one would believe that it is so great, and much time might be lost in the endeavour to adjust the contents and the dates of his documents. As it is, we can only say, that where any difficulty connected with these papers occurs, the surest method of solving the difficulty is to begin by taking it for granted that the editor has made some mistake.

The ridiculousness of the mistake in the instance we have just given is, moreover, much enhanced by the consideration of the contents of the letter of the King of Scots. One of the particular reasons assigned in January, 1524, according to M. Theiner, for wishing to promote the Abbot of Paisley, and to give the abbey to his kinsman, the Earl of Arran's natural son, was that the king wished to conciliate the nobles of his kingdom. Just nine months afterwards, if we are to believe M. Theiner's arrangement (of course, it is nearly just three months earlier), the king writes to the pope, to say that he has come to his majority, and thrown off the yoke of the Duke of Albany, who had been endeavouring to conciliate the prelates and nobles to his own faction. Accordingly, the king requests that upon any vacancy in an abbey or bishopric, the pope will be pleased to wait eight months, till he shall have heard the king's wishes with regard to the appointment to be made, and then only appoint such persons as are nominated by the king himself, no attention being paid to the Duke of Albany's nominations, because the king had altogether banished him and excluded him from his councils. There is, moreover, another document to the same purpose, dated November 28, 1524.

We just notice, in passing, a letter from the King of England to the pope, in which he thanks him for the plenary remission kindly accorded to himself and his most serene consort, who are departing on a journey of devotion. The letter is amongst the last, probably, in which Catharine is referred to in kindly terms. It is dated from Anteyll, which is one of M. Theiner's ingenious methods of spelling Amphill. In another place he

spells it Duteyll. At least, if Peter Vannes spelt the name in this way, it is the only instance we know of in which the secretary for the Latin tongue made such an egregious blunder.

The course of events next takes us to the letter in which the request is made by the king to Clement VII. that he will promote Campeggio to the see of Salisbury. The true date of the letter is of course 1524, but M. Theiner, probably in this instance by a mere error of press, has dated it November 1, 1514. This and the following letter of Wolsey's to the pope, written ten days afterwards, show, indirectly, how absolutely omnipotent Wolsey was both at Rome and in England. A casual reader might think it a singular coincidence that Henry and the pope had fixed upon the same Italian cardinal to promote to the see of Salisbury—for the interval of ten days does not allow of the supposition of the request having reached the pope and having been acceded to. There was no telegraphic communication in those days, and no courier could have posted to Rome and returned between the 1st and the 11th of November. The real account of the matter is, that Wolsey had signified to the pope and the king that Campeggio was to be Bishop of Salisbury. The reason is obvious; Wolsey knew of Campeggio's learning and sagacity, and saw how useful he would be in putting down the Lutheran heresy which was just beginning to show its head in England. Wolsey describes him as one '*qui in arduo Lutheri negotio strenue versatur.*' And it is very remarkable how utterly he disregarded all considerations of present expediency or compromise when he had an end to gain. In this case it is interesting to see from the letter how the insular feeling, which has always characterized this country, comes out. We have never seen it noticed in any history—and probably this letter contains the only evidence extant—that the whole of the diocese of Salisbury expressed their aversion to the expected appointment, and that the dissatisfaction spread throughout the whole country. The words are:—

*'Nec hæc sua voluntas ab universâ Sarisburiensi diocesi, omnique ferme Regni clero assiduè precibus summisque adnidente rationibus, asserente quoque hujus Episcopatus quieti ac solacio pessime consultum iri, si Cardinali et extero absentì illius cura crederetur neutiquam potuerit immutari.'*

M. Theiner or his amanuensis is not familiar even with the ordinary contractions of the writing of this period. In a letter from the Cardinal of York to the pope, written in April, 1525, we have one sentence made absolute nonsense of because the editor did not know Wolsey's method of writing the word *tamen*. He has represented it as *tum*, and so made the sentence unconstructable. There are so many more passages in this volume which we can make nothing of, that we have no hesitation in

accounting for the difficulty on the same hypothesis of ignorance and carelessness in the transcribing and overlooking the manuscripts. This document is numbered DCCCCXLVIII. We may call attention to that which is numbered DCCCCLXX as being wrongly dated 1526. It manifestly belongs to the year 1525.

The principal point of interest in the letters of this period is to see how Wolsey managed everything. He advises and encourages Clement as if the pope were a mere child. Beneath the profoundest expressions of respect and submission on Wolsey's part, it is easy to see that both the correspondents know that the pope's judgment would weigh as nothing if it should happen ever to differ from the cardinal's. We need hardly add, it never did differ from it. The same may be said of the king, whose subject he was. The king and the cardinal generally wrote on the same day, and the letters are much to the same purpose—the principal difference being, that in the one case the Latinity is the cardinal's own, in the other the composition (as far, that is, as rendering the English into Latin goes) is that of Peter Vannes, the new secretary for the Latin tongue. Occasionally, as in the recall of the Bishop of Bath, Wolsey thinks it worth while to inform the pope that he has persuaded the king to this step, but it is plain that the observation was supererogatory, and that it was taken for granted that the king and his chief councillor generally agreed in opinion, and that that opinion was formed first in the cardinal's brain. It is interesting too to observe that about this time the method of writing in cypher begins to appear. What has become of the cyphered despatches alluded to in the communications between Henry and Wolsey on the one side, and the pope on the other, we do not know. But we should not be surprised to learn that they have been preserved at the Vatican. It would only be of a piece with the rest of the execution of this volume, if M. Theiner had known of the existence of such cyphers and had made no attempt to decypher the letters.

It is perhaps worth while to caution the readers of this volume against the date of 1526 being assigned to letter DCCCCXLVII, which really belongs to the following year. An incautious reader might be led to suppose that the Lutheran heresy had appeared in Scotland earlier than it really did, and had spread more rapidly than we have any reason to suppose from other histories. On DCCCCXLIX some little attention we suppose has been bestowed, for it contains the addition of an [*ut*] in brackets on the editor's part to complete one of the sentences which seemed to require it, but in reality does just as well without it. It is a pity that the editor paid no more attention to the heading of the letter, which runs as follows:—

'*Cardinalis Eboracensis pontifici de bullâ confirmatoriâ collegii Oxoniensis sibi missâ grates reddit, petitque ut in eâdem quædam a nomina scriptore perperam scripta corrigantur.*' The mistake indeed is evident, and can easily be corrected. It is probably simply a transposition due to the carelessness of a compositor; but we suppose M. Theiner did not trust the compositor with the composition of his headings. The probability is, that any printer who understood Latin would have described them more accurately. In the present instance, no notice is taken of the larger half of the letter, in which Wolsey accredits Sir John Russell to the pope. The letter itself, by its complaint of the wrong spelling of the names of places and persons in the pope's bull, is sufficient to justify a good many of M. Theiner's readings in other parts of the volume; but it does not justify M. Theiner's Italian mode of spelling the name Rossell in this and other documents of the same date, for certainly Wolsey's original letter, from which these documents have been copied, never spelt it in that way. The only other fault we have to find with this letter is, that it is assigned to January 8, 1526, but really belongs to the same day of the following year.

No. DCCCCLXXX is a breve to the King of Scots, exhorting him to keep his kingdom clear of the Lutheran heresy. This is dated in Roman fashion, January 11, 1526, '*pontificatûs tertio*'; but M. Theiner has given the answer to it a few pages back, just ten days before the date of the breve.

We had hoped to finish our account of this interesting volume in a single article. But we have already exceeded the usual limits of a review, and perhaps trespassed too far on the reader's patience; and though by far the most important portion of the volume remains, we must be content to reserve the history of the divorce and the new light thrown upon it by these documents to a future opportunity.

---

ART. IV.—1. *Central and Eastern Arabia*. By WILLIAM GIFFORD PALGRAVE. London: Macmillan. 1865.

2. *Letters from Egypt*. By LADY DUFF GORDON. London: Macmillan. 1865.

THE gift of narrative does not always, perhaps does not commonly, accompany those peculiar powers and impulses which constitute a traveller. A man may have cultivated observation, intelligent curiosity, love of adventure, physical strength, endurance, resource, and a passionate desire to pursue and trace out the unknown,—for the indulgence of which no sacrifice of ease, indeed no risk may be too great,—and yet when he returns home he may be at a total loss how to reproduce his own impressions for the benefit of others. What he has felt vividly tames down, in spite of all his pains, in the telling; he fails to select points of universal interest, those touches of nature to be seen and felt everywhere, escape in the heavy labours of composition; he loses himself in dead uniformity of detail; his story plods on, in spite of himself, journal fashion; and, setting down what he did with monotonous exactness, he raises no pictures of what he saw. The majority of men, indeed, who write their travels, only excite the wonder of their readers, why, seeing so little and caring for so few things, and evidencing a curiosity so dead to all that is distinctive in the countries and scenes they have visited, they should ever have travelled at all. But of such we do not speak. The defect we notice may and does belong to master-spirits who have set out on their adventures in every respect well prepared, who have pursued their avocation as it should be pursued, and who have succeeded where success was honour and fame—succeeded with the one exception of rendering the history of their long labours and discoveries as interesting as it ought to be to their readers.

To this reproach, at least, neither of the books before us is open. No one can call Mr. Palgrave's '*Arabia*' dull, no one who is capable of entering into a narrative of travel at all will here declare himself stranded; there is no monotony, but all is new, and strange, and tempting to the curiosity. And in so far as Lady Duff Gordon's work may be classed in the same category at all, her '*Letters from Egypt*' are equally safe from the charge of dulness. We may have our own quarrel

with her on other grounds, but candour compels the admission that her book is uncommonly pleasant and easy reading.

It is on this point only that any comparison can fairly stand between works of such different scope and importance,—on this and the further one, that each author writes from absolutely personal observation, that each is a discoverer, the one of unknown kingdoms and polities, the other of virtues and interesting qualities in a race hitherto regarded with universal contempt, too degraded, indeed, to be objects of interesting inquiry.

For our part, we own it to be an agreeable variation from modern custom to find a traveller from the East who has preserved his Christian antagonism to Mahometanism intact and undiluted. For reasons which satisfy himself, Mr. Palgrave was a silent protester against the errors and evils of Islam. Whatever was the nature of his mission, proselytising formed no part of it. If he did not conceal his religion, he never considered it his duty to declare it; and when the people among whom he found himself took him for a Muslim, he willingly left them in error. But, as a silent witness, he lived in continual protest, and was habitually treasuring up proofs and arguments to show that the stricter the adherence to the Coran (for so he writes it) the more the Mahometan notion of the Deity diverged from our Christian ideal; so that in no point and at no time is the object of worship of the two *creeds* the same, though he would not extend this assertion to all nominal professors of Islam. Fatalism he represents as more than a dogma; it influences every thought and action, inevitably turning zeal into fanaticism; and resignation into hopeless acquiescence in 'that inexorable will which they worship under the name of God.' Of course the view of this turning doctrine of Mahometanism must be influenced by temperament and personal characteristics. Mr. Palgrave's language often ignores difficulties that lie in the very nature of things; he expresses himself not seldom in terms we cannot follow: and where eye-witnesses of apparently equal honesty and credibility differ as to the results of a given class of opinions, we must use our judgment in drawing a balance between them. Still his own line is borne out by his facts. Such writers as Mr. Formby and later followers of his school may enlarge on the 'exceeding' devotion to the service of God, which the true Turk of the old 'school everywhere exhibits,' regarding the Muslim divinity as the same in attributes with the Christian; but this view is surely irreconcilable alike with the present posture and past history of Mahometanism.

The position is undoubtedly open to question of a Christian in strange lands who suppresses his Christianity, and it is one



which in our day we have often to contemplate. It can scarcely be other than highly perilous to the faith of any one who practises this concealment. Whatever religion Mr. Palgrave's fellow-collegian, Captain Burton, may have started with in his pilgrimage to Mecca, he will not resent our inference that it is not at present Christianity. As for M. Vambéry, his dervish life (a disguise which we perceive Mr. Palgrave holds it impossible really to maintain) seemed to become so natural to him, and the profession of Mahometanism so much part of himself, that we hardly can distinguish between the outward confession and the inward thought. The sham cannot stop short, one would think, of heart and soul, and he must by this time be at least as much a Muslim as anything else. Mr. Palgrave pronounces it a position he could not conscientiously maintain, and expends some pains in drawing a broad line between his course and that of others. We can easily believe that his extreme readiness would often spare his conscience some breadth of equivocation; but there must have been occasions when this ingenuity was put to too critical a test, occasions which Mr. Palgrave does not think it necessary to report *in extenso*. However, we do not care to press the matter too closely. It is a case for the casuists, of whom our author is himself a very ingenious example, to be treated along with vivisection and other practices not easy to vindicate, but from which mankind so far profits that the error seems, as it were, diffused over the whole community that avails itself of discoveries reached by these means.

Mr. Palgrave implies that his journey had an object beyond that of the ordinary traveller, or the restlessness of enterprise not rare in Englishmen, beyond even the nobler hope 'of doing something towards the permanent social good of those wide regions, or the desire of bringing the stagnant waters of Eastern life into contact with the quickening stream of European progress,'—a secret mission not imparted to the reader. Just as M. Huc had a twofold purpose,—the one confided to the readers of his delightful volumes of travel, the other reported to the head of his order,—so Mr. Palgrave, who at the time of the undertaking was in connexion with the Jesuit order, gives his adventures to the English reader, but has a further account to render to the Emperor of the French, who defrayed the expenses of the expedition. It has been asserted, with a confidence that ought to be derived from private information, that Mr. Palgrave was distinctly accredited by the Emperor to Telâlebn-Rasheed, the powerful ruler of Shomer; but we scarcely know how to reconcile this statement with his own seemingly slight knowledge, if any, of this potentate. Thus in crossing

the desert which separates by an all but impassable wall Central Arabia from the outer world, the Bedouins, who formed his escort, talked to him of Telāl, the sovereign of Djebel Shomer, extolling his various great qualities in terms which seemed to awaken a new curiosity. He already knew, he says, that Central Arabia belonged in part to the Wahhabee dynasty, and

‘Of Telāl-ebn-Rasheed in particular, as a ruler somehow connected with the Wahhabee, I had also heard mention, though vague, in Syria and at Damascus; where some distinguished him from and others confounded him with the dynasty of Nejed. So putting this and that together, we now guessed that he must be a subordinate ruler, a sort of provincial governor in Wahhabee behalf; a conjecture which, like many others, proved neither exactly right nor entirely wrong.’—*A Year's Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia*, vol. i. p. 15.

How this vague knowledge is compatible with an accredited mission we do not know; for Mr. Palgrave would hardly grant that other Europeans were more distinctly informed of Arabian affairs than he himself; especially adapted as he was for the task of exploring the interior of the country, by a familiarity with the Arabic language till it had become almost a mother tongue; and an experience in the ways and manners of Semitic nations which he knew to be exceptional. It is time, however, to enter upon the narrative itself. This is given with such rare dramatic skill as at once to amuse and charm the reader by its romantic interest, and to convince him of its absolute accuracy wherever the writer's own observation is the authority. Not a slight example of this skill is the mode in which the story opens; plunging, as it does, at once into the desert, with all the accompaniments of heat, thirst, length and aridness, poison-wind and desolation; all the aggregate of difficulties and perils which cut off, and must for ever cut off, the mass of mankind from the world he is going to picture to us. He himself was as alive to the romance of his task as his reader can be, and owns himself not seldom encouraged under the extreme toils of the passage by the poet's stimulus to discovery; ‘the many fail, the one succeeds,’ and by the ‘trust to light on something fair,’ which lies at the heart of all adventure. In fancy taking his journey with him and entering into all its vicissitudes, each several scene comes upon us with a distinct vividness which those voyagers experience who pass from city to city, and shore to shore, without any gradual change of landscape to lull the attention and accustom the eye to each new phase. All the way through, indeed, the great sea of sand performs the part of the ocean, separating and giving distinctness to each country here visited, while the characteristics of this fiery sea are given with a picturesque force which sustain our interest and sympathy throughout.

There are a few popular prejudices of which Mr. Palgrave makes it his business to disabuse his readers; and here, no doubt, some caution on our part is needed. It is easy to see how many and various are the qualities possessed by our traveller that especially fit him for his vocation. But our experience tells us that men so gifted have generally some idiosyncrasy which disturbs the balance of judgment; very few men, that is, have the gift of eloquence, the power of making other languages their own, a grasp of the present situation, whatever it is, and unbounded resources; and *also* an impartial judgment taking a clear view of each side of every question. That is, persons with Mr. Palgrave's class of powers are often prejudiced. We have no means of knowing how our rule bears in his case; but, as a rule, we observe that such persons learn to trust themselves and to found theories on insufficient grounds, good as far as they go, but insufficient. These reservations we have to make to ourselves, tempering the acquiescence in his views and opinions which it is Mr. Palgrave's art to gain from his readers. We are in his hands; he tells us of things on which he is immeasurably better informed than ourselves, and he tells them with a confidence and persuasiveness which leaves no loophole for doubt or question.

There is one personage, however, about whom we have had distinct ideas from our childhood; everybody who has read anything has been led into a romantic notion of a Bedouin Arab. It is Mr. Palgrave's especial pleasure to blow upon these traditions, and the Bedouins suffer an awful drop in our fancy by the time he has done with them. When once their space and territory is circumscribed this process has begun. The popular idea, till lately, has been that Central Arabia is occupied by those nomades; that they have the huge territory all to themselves. Mr. Palgrave finds their masters and betters wherever he goes; and, of all the inhabitants of Arabia, places them lowest in the scale, at once of morals, intelligence, and personal characteristics. As they predominate or are held in check, the country is barbarous or civilized. After all, we might have known that the hospitality of which we have heard so much could not be a very real virtue in conjunction with habits of pillage: and where treachery would so materially aid these habits it is more easy to believe in it, than to suppose that the principle of thieving, when in full force, should be held in by romantic scruples. He tells horrible stories of rich travellers being led purposely astray, and then left for thirst and weariness to do their work; when they are plundered and left to their fate. These, however, are not common cases. He begins his portraiture from the three Bedouins who formed his escort from Ma'an to the Djowf. The leader,

Salim-el-'Atneh, was a member of a powerful family of Howeytat Arabs, but whom repeated acts of robbery and pillage, with a supplementary murder now and then, had rendered so conspicuous that he was little better than an outlaw. However, some civilization is so necessary to Mr. Palgrave's idea of a man,—he has so little taste for the mere lout, barbarian or savage,—that he greatly prefers this worthy to his associates, on the ground that 'a brave, foresighted man can always be trusted to a certain extent'; whereas the other two were wild, fickle, and restless, and with intellects so uncultivated, that Salim himself advised against familiarity, lest 'it should diminish the involuntary awe of the savage for the civilized man.' The dress of these personages is—

'A long and very dirty shirt, reaching nearly to the ankles, a black cotton handkerchief over the head, fastened on by a twist of camel's hair, a tattered cloak, striped white and brown, a leather girdle, much the worse for wear, from which dangled a rusty knife, a long-barrelled and cumbrous matchlock, a yet longer sharp-pointed spear, a powder-belt, broken and coarsely patched up with thread—such was the accoutrement of these worthies, and such, indeed, is the ordinary Bedouin guise on a journey.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 4, 5.

Further on he gives a touch of the conversation of the tribes they encountered.

'But how am I to describe their conversation, their questions and answers, their manners and gesticulations? "A sensible person in this city is like a man tied up among a drove of mules in a stable," I once heard from a respectable stranger in the Syrian town of Homs, a locality proverbial for the sullen stupidity of its denizens. But among Bedouins in the desert, where the advantages of the stable are wanting, the guest rather resembles a man in the middle of a field among untied mules frisking and kicking their heels in all directions around him. Here you may see human nature at its lowest stage, or very nearly; one sprawls stretched out on the sand, another draws unmeaning lines with the end of his stick, a third grins, a fourth asks purportless or impertinent questions, or cuts jokes meant for witty, but in fact only coarse in the extreme. Meanwhile the boys thrust themselves forward without restraint, and interrupt their elders, their betters I can hardly say, without the smallest respect or deference.

'And yet in all this there is no real intention of rudeness, no desire to annoy; quite the reverse. They sincerely wish to make themselves agreeable to the new comers, to put them at their ease, nay, to do them what good service they can, only they do not exactly know how to set about it; if they violate all laws of decorum or courtesy, it is out of sheer ignorance, not malice prepense; and amid the aimlessness of an utterly uncultivated mind they occasionally show indications of considerable innate tact and shrewdness; while through all the fickleness proper to men accustomed to no moral or physical restraint, there appears the groundwork of a manly and generous character, such as a Persian or a Turk seldom, if ever, offers. Their defects are inherent to their condition, their redeeming qualities are their own.

'What better, in fact, can be expected of men whose whole lives have passed in driving camels about open wastes, without law, without religion, without instruction, without example? And instead of all these amid

extreme want, unceasing privation, frequent danger, and security never. It is the education of a savage; and that such a school should send out such pupils is perfectly natural. I only wish that those who indulge their imagination in ideal portraits of desert life, and conceive the Bedouins and their condition to be worthy of admiration or of envy, would pass but three days in a Sherarat encampment, and see, not through the medium of romancing narratives, written *à priori*, as they say, for ready currency, but with their own eyes, to what a depth of degradation one of the noblest races earth affords can descend under the secular influence of nomade life.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 23, 24.

Strange to say, however, the rude talk he reports is uniformly spoken in the purest Arabic, 'following the minute rules and exigencies of "what is sometimes, though very incorrectly, called 'the grammatical dialect.'" It is only in Central Arabia that the language of the Coran is a spoken language. And further, whatever the degradation of the speaker, the gift of an accurate pronunciation seems universal, and very grateful to Mr. Palgrave's somewhat fastidious ear. For their faults and vices, Mahometanism is at least not answerable, for he holds the Bedouin as still a pagan in heart. On the first start of his journey he observed, as the sun rose, formal acts of worship, in express contravention of the Mahometan code.

'Hardly had the first clear rays struck level across the horizon, than our nomade companions, facing the rising disk, began to recite alternately, but without any previous ablution or even dismounting from their beasts, certain formulas of adoration and invocation, nor desisted till the entire orb rode clear above the desert edge. Sun-worshippers as they were before the days of Mahomet, they still remain such; and all that the Hejâz prophet could say, or the doctors of his law repeat, touching the devil's horns between which the great day-star rises, as true Mahometans know or ought to know, and the consequently diabolical character of worship at such a time, and in a posture, too, which directs prayers and adorations then made exactly towards the Satanic headgear, has been entirely thrown away on those obstinate adherents to ancient customs.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 8, 9.

In fact, he asserts that in the course of twelve centuries Mahometanism, for good or ill, has made little or no impression on the Bedouins; simply because they are incapable of receiving or retaining any of the serious influences and forms of thought and practice which affect the fixed populations of Arabia. Occasionally they deem it prudent to assume the name of Mahometans, and even 'to go through some prayer' or religious formula when they can manage to learn any.' But taking the Sherarat Bedouin as a fair unadulterated specimen of the class, he asserts that one and all are no better acquainted than any honest English drover might be with the customary forms of Mahometan worship, with its prostrations and rehearsals, ablutions and rites. 'Of the pilgrimages they know nothing except in the way of pillaging the

'pilgrims;' to the fast of Ramadhan they are totally indifferent. Morality with them is at so low a depth of degradation, that Mahometan restrictions or relaxations of the law of marriage are superfluous. The only redeeming point in the dark picture is, that being immoral, they know that they are so, only the avowal seems to cost them nothing. They are apparently without reverence, and material in their views of every subject presented to them. God is with them a chief, residing mainly, it would seem, in the sun, with which they in a manner identify Him; they regard Him much as they do the more powerful magnates within their experience. However, it is granted that they do know the difference between virtue and vice in their broader forms; the grosser forms of crime are Sheyn, 'a shame,' and it is granted that they are not a bloodthirsty race, and never murder gratuitously, or for the pleasure of the deed.

The picture of the Bedouin would not be complete without the companion portrait of the camel, Mr. Palgrave's dislike of which seems, as it were, to temper his view of the camel-driver. He quotes the saying that God created the Bedouin for the camel and the camel for the Bedouin. We feel that they go together, and that if we could see better traits in the docile beast we might also see them in its appointed master.

'I have, while in England, heard and read more than once of the "docile camel." If "docile" means stupid, well and good; in such a case the camel is the very model of docility. But if the epithet is intended to designate an animal that takes an interest in his rider so far as a beast can, that in some way understands his intentions or shares them in a subordinate fashion, that obeys from a sort of submissive or half fellow-feeling with his master, like the horse and elephant, then I say that the camel is by no means docile, very much the contrary; he takes no heed of his rider, pays no attention whether he be on his back or not, walks straight on when once set a going, merely because he is too stupid to turn aside; and then, should some tempting thorn or green branch allure him out of the path, continues to walk on in this new direction simply because he is too dull to turn back into the right road. His only care is to cross as much pasture as he conveniently can while pacing mechanically onwards; and for effecting this his long flexible neck sets him at great advantage, and a hard blow or a downright kick alone has any influence on him whether to direct or impel. He will never attempt to throw you off his back, such a trick being far beyond his limited comprehension; but if you fall off, he will never dream of stopping for you, and walks on just the same, grazing while he goes, without knowing or caring an atom what has become of you. If turned loose, it is a thousand to one that he will never find his way back to his accustomed home or pasture, and the first comer who picks him up will have no particular shyness to get over; Jack or Tom are all the same to him, and the loss of his old master and of his former cameline companions gives him no regret and occasions no endeavour to find them again. One only symptom will he give that he is aware of his rider, and that is when the latter is about to mount him, for on such an occasion, instead of addressing him in the style of old Balaam's more intelligent beast, "Am not I thy camel upon which thou hast ridden



ever since I was thine, unto this day?" he will bend back his long snaky neck towards his master, open his enormous jaws to bite if he dared, and roar out a tremendous sort of groan, as if to complain of some entirely new and unparalleled injustice about to be done him. In a word, he is from first to last an undomesticated and savage animal, rendered serviceable by stupidity alone, without much skill on his master's part or any co-operation on his own, save that of an extreme passiveness. Neither attachment nor even habit impress him; never tame, though not wide awake enough to be exactly wild.

'One passion alone he possesses, namely revenge, of which he furnishes many a hideous example, while in carrying it out he shows an unexpected degree of far-thoughted malice, united meanwhile with all the cold stupidity of his usual character.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 39, 40.

Then follows a formidable example of this one quickening instinct. But whatever the camel is, it is the round man in the round hole, in the desert; whether that desert is a 'wide and level plain, blackened over with countless pebbles of basalt and flint,' the only living herbs the bitter, poisonous colocynth; such as he passed through from Ma'an to Djowf; or that immense ocean of loose reddish sand farther inland, unlimited to the eye, and heaped up in enormous ridges running parallel to each other from north to south, undulation after undulation, between which the traveller finds himself imprisoned in a suffocating sand-pit, hemmed in on every side by burning walls, till, labouring up the slope, he overlooks what seems a vast sea of fire swelling under a monsoon wind, and ruffled by a cross blast into red-hot waves. Here under the vertical flaming sun, where no skill can prevent the precious water from evaporating through the skins in which it is enclosed; where everything takes the smell of burning, and scarcely permits the touch; where Mr. Palgrave, injured to heat and hardship, said to his companion, 'were this eternal it were hell,' and received only the answer of a desponding silence; the patient creature plods on. But this is not a scene to develop the affections; the 'ship of the desert' lands its rider on the other side, but neither man nor beast grow amiable under such or analogous life-long experiences. It sounds the very minimum of happiness, and the results upon the character are what we might expect.

After crossing the level, pebbly desert, the effect upon the reader of the first sight of the tufted palm-groves, clustering fruit-trees, and green patches of Djowf, large brown masses of irregular masonry, round towers, and flat house-tops buried in garden foliage and shimmering in a flood of light and heat, is delightful. He quotes the saying of an Arabic poet: 'Like the paradise of eternity, none can enter it till after having previously passed over hell-bridge.' Mr. Palgrave is able to impart to his readers his own sense of contrast. A further air of romance is given by the appearance upon the scene, exactly

at the right moment, of certain flying horsemen, led by a handsome youth, well armed, well mounted, and with long curling hair, till we might fancy we had hit upon another 'Talisman' of Sir Walter Scott. Mr. Palgrave learnt afterwards, that it was an even chance what reception this young cavalier, with an elder companion not less suited to the situation,— 'a man of about forty years of age, tall, well-made, dark complexioned, with a look that inspired some mistrust, while it denoted much intelligence, and more habitual haughtiness,'— should give the strangers. They were, in fact, hospitably entertained, feasted on the delicious dates of Djowf, refreshed by the purest springs, and made welcome with coffee, about which Mr. Palgrave is always eloquent, and which he assures us can be drunk only in Arabia. He writes—

'I have said in the preceding chapter, that while we were yet threading the narrow gorge near the first entrance of the valley, several horsemen appeared on the upper margin of the pass, and one of them questioned our guide, and then, after a short consultation with his companions, called out to us to go on and fear nothing. Now the name of this individual was Sulman-ebn-Dâhir, a very adventurous and fairly intelligent young fellow, with whom next-door neighbourhood and frequent intercourse rendered us intimate during our stay at the Djowf. One day, while we were engaged in friendly conversation, he said, half laughing, "Do you know what we were consulting about while you were in the pass below on the morning of your arrival? It was whether we should make you a good reception, and thus procure ourselves the advantage of having you residents amongst us, or whether we should not do better to kill you all three, and take our gain from the booty to be found in your baggage." I replied with equal coolness, "It might have proved an awkward affair for yourself and your friends, since Hamood your governor could hardly have failed to get wind of the matter, and would have taken it out of you." "Pooh!" replied our friend, "never a bit; as if a present out of the plunder would not have tied Hamood's tongue." "Bedouins that you are," said I, laughing. "Of course we are," answered Sulman, "for such we all were till quite lately, and the present system is too recent to have much changed us." However, he admitted that they all had, on second thoughts, congratulated themselves on not having preferred bloodshed to hospitality, though perhaps the better resolution was rather owing to interested than to moral motives.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 66, 67.

However, once admitted to their favours, he gives his testimony to the liberality of the Djowfites; nowhere else in Arabia is the guest (if he be not murdered on the outset) better treated or more cordially invited to become one of themselves. The province of the Djowf is a sort of oasis; a large oval depression, of sixty or seventy miles long, by ten or twelve broad, and is the 'porch or vestibule' of Central Arabia, and of the kingdom of Djebel Shomer the sovereignty of Telal. The only town is a conglomeration of eight villages which have gradually grown together; the principal of these contains a central castle, and about four hundred houses; the other quarters are connected

by extensive gardens, till the whole place runs to a length of four miles. Every house contains a separate family; indeed, throughout the whole of Arabia, Mr. Palgrave doubts if two families ever occupy the same dwelling. The arrangements all sound perfectly civilized, every considerable house containing an outer court, an inner court, a large reception room, and several smaller apartments for the family. The gardens, all enclosed by high walls of unbaked brick, are celebrated for productive-ness. The date-palm is the main object of cultivation; apricots, peaches, fig-trees, and the vine abound, and in the intervals grow corn, vegetables, gourds, and melons, the whole watered by many streams; in this an exception to every other even fertile part of Central Arabia, where water has to be dug for, and can only be laboriously procured from wells and cisterns. Mr. Palgrave roughly estimates the inhabitants of this favoured region at something exceeding forty thousand, explaining, however, his inability to procure anything like accurate information in a country where the 'census is unknown, and there are no registers of births, deaths, or marriages.'

The Djowfites affirm of themselves that they were once Christians, and that they were first converted to Islamism by the sword. At a later period they relapsed into semi-paganism, till the sword of the Wahhabee 'again revived their Islam.' They owe their present prosperity to Telāl, whose father had nominally annexed them to his new kingdom of Djebel Shomer, a conquest which the son carried through with a high hand. By his rule the inhabitants have so much profited in peace, civilization, and deliverance from Bedouin outrage, that they are apparently contented under the yoke. In appearance, their large developed forms and open countenances contrast strongly with the somewhat dwarfish stature and suspicious under-glances of the Bedouin; they are remarkably healthy, and retain their vigour to a late age. This is no doubt mainly due to the climate, which is dry and good here as in most parts of Central Arabia. But superior as they are in politeness and self-respect to the Bedouin, their manners yet come far short of the dignified and polished courtesy usual in Shomer and Nejed of Central Arabia, or of Haṣa and 'Omān, on the eastern coast. But of the last, Mr. Palgrave must have a very high idea indeed, when we find him giving his deliberate opinion that the choicer spirits of Arabia understand the art of conversation better than the *beaux esprits* of the West. Their talk is more easy, and they hear one another out.

It has been remarked almost as an objection to Mr. Palgrave, by one of his warmest admirers, that his humour is magnetically attracted towards theological speculation, and that

casuistry about Allah is his 'shop.' To us it is one of the main interests of this work that the subject of Mahometanism has occupied the full mind of so acute an observer. In a sense, he does not allow the Arabs' nature to be congenial with this system; its fatalism is opposed to much in them. In the first place, of all Orientals he considers the Arabs, when seen under circumstances which develop their better qualities, most like Englishmen.

'A strong love and a high appreciation of national and personal liberty, a hatred of minute interference and special regulations, a great respect for authority so long as it be decently well exercised, joined with a remarkable freedom from anything like caste-feeling in what concerns ruling families and dynasties; much practical good sense, much love of commercial enterprise, a great readiness to undertake long journeys and voluntary expatriation by land and sea in search of gain and power; patience to endure, and perseverance in the employment of means to ends, courage in war, vigour in peace, and lastly, the marked predominance of a superior race over whomever they come in contact with among their Asiatic or African neighbours, a superiority admitted by these last as a matter of course and an acknowledged right;—all these are features hardly less characteristic of the Englishman than of the Arab; yet that these are features distinctive of the Arab nation, taken, of course, on its more favourable side, will hardly, I think, be denied by any experienced and unprejudiced man.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 70.

It has been said in the same strain that Persians most resemble Frenchmen, but he would not willingly pay our neighbours so ill a compliment. Drawing a distinction between the reverential and the religious instinct, and proving that a religious people is often remarkable for its manifold irreverence, he pronounces the Arabs not a religious people, though compelled, very much against the grain, to appear such under the rigid rule of those Puritans of Islam, the Wahhabees. If the following is a true report, he certainly proves his point as regards one-half of the statement.

'Let me then be here allowed a moment's pause on the way to consider that curious and important object, the religious aspect of the Arab race in general; we shall hardly meet with a more fitting opportunity. The Arabs are, generally speaking, rather a believing than a religious nation; nor is the phase of mind hereby indicated a mere paradox, as one might at first sight hold it to be. Men who readily grant an abstract belief to everything are not unlikely to reconcile, in a practical way, the many contradictions thus admitted into their theory by acting on nothing. Christian, Jewish, Mahometan, or Pagan creeds and forms,—the Arab, when left to himself, does not see why they should not all be equally true, equally estimable, while at the same time he does not either see any very cogent reason for following one rather than the other; and thus comes to the happy conclusion of binding himself to none. Not that he entertains the smallest doubt regarding the divine mission of any of the six hundred prophets generally enumerated from Adam down to Mahomet inclusively, and even El-Mokannaa' himself, as we shall ultimately see in 'Omān, but

he is unwilling to give any one of them in particular an adherence prejudicial to the rights of the rest. Besides he is fond of ease and impatient of restraint; stated prayers annoy him, long prayers tire him, ablutions are inconvenient, and fasting, especially in presence of a fat sheep, is quite out of the question, if indeed his ordinary allowance of nutriment might not be called a perpetual fast, and even a severe one.

'It is true that among a very large number this immense latitude of belief has led to an equally or even a more logical consequence, namely, entire scepticism, and a settled resolution to prefer the certain to the uncertain, the present to the future.

'Shall I abandon the pleasures of the pure wine-goblet  
For all they tell me about milk and honey hereafter?  
Life, and death, and resurrection to follow,  
—Stuff and nonsense, my dear Madam:

are the too celebrated lines of a very popular Arab poet, and I have often heard them quoted in moments of unreserved conversation with unequivocal approval on the part of all present. Not that even thus the Arab exactly disbelieves, but that he has made up his mind not to "fash his thumb" about the matter.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 68, 69.

Under these circumstances, it is strange that the dominant religious party in Arabia should be the Wahhabees, of whom we hear more as he advances farther into the heart of the country. Even Telāl, liberal as he was observed to be in his own creed and practices, yet found it politic to conform outwardly to these fanatics of Islam, and, along with the 'council of three' sent from his capital to administer affairs at the Djowf, appears the Metow'waa', or

'Clergyman, if you will, (the literal meaning of the Arabic word is, "one who enforces obedience," to God, understood)—an old sour-faced gentleman sent hither to teach the men of Djowf their catechism, and little liked either by his scholars or his companions; a circumstance nowise tending to improve his habitually bad temper. In a Friday's sermon, at which I was present, he gave vent to his zealous wrath at the irremediable lukewarmness of the Djowfite Gallios, and threatened them with such an outpouring of Divine vengeance, that he quite overdid his subject, and provoked a sarcastic laugh where he calculated on terror and contrition. From this worthy, as my readers may expect, we met with no especial tokens of benevolence.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 79.

An antipathy, evidently mutual, existed between Mr. Palgrave and the members of the Wahhabee party throughout his whole journey. Their proceedings constantly furnish him with the text for a protest; whether in favour of 'the shameful,' as they call tobacco, or 'that other abomination,' the wine cup,—which, in an eloquent passage, he endeavours to prove one great promoter of fellowship, civilization, thought, and progress; and as such denounced by Mahomet, and ever held by 'Christians, in the most comprehensive sense of the term,' in high favour. Not that wine seems, as far as we read, even a temptation in Arabia. They used, in a former age, to make wine

from the date-palm, but this is discontinued. From one end of the peninsula to the other coffee, when they can get it, seems the only beverage.

From the Djowf our traveller crossed the Great Desert—the Nefood, or sand passes, as it is called—to Djebel Shomer. There is an extraordinary charm in these journeys, but we must dwell rather on the discoveries to which they led him. Of these the most remarkable is the master-spirit of this unknown world, Ṭelāl, of whom he says, that among all rulers or governors, European or Asiatic, with whose acquaintance he ever chanced to be honoured, he knows few equal in the true art of government. It is something, in these days, to come upon a model sovereign, of whom one may say no European ever heard before. These are the reflections of Mr. Palgrave at his first audience with Ṭelāl-ebn-Rasheed:—

“How many of those I know would give half their having to be present at such a scene and in such a locality,” thought I, while almost wondering at our own quiet and secure position amid the multitude; for, to say truth, how little of Arab rule or life has yet been witnessed by Europeans, how little faithfully described? Half romantic and always over-coloured scenes of wild Bedouins, painted up into a sort of chivalresque knight-errants and representatives of unthralled freedom; or, perhaps, the heavy and hollow formalities of some coast or frontier courtlet, more than half Ottomanized; apocryphal legends, like those of Lamartine, and the sentimental superficialities of his school,—such is almost all that we possess on these subjects, and from which we are invited to form our criterion and appreciation of Arabia and its people. But not in the Syrian desert, nor on the limits of the Hejāz, not in the streets of Mokha, nor in the markets of Meshid 'Alee, still less at Bagdad or Damascus, is the true idea of genuine Arab ways and manners to be sought or found.’—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 136, 137.

The foundation of the kingdom of Djebel Shomer was laid by Ṭelāl's father, who had served under the Wahhabees,—the powerful party whose history and policy occupies no small part of these volumes,—and whom Ṭelāl still found it prudent to defer to; acknowledging also in words the supreme authority of the Sultan of Turkey. It is, however, as an independent sovereign, with a more unfettered power than modern sovereigns often possess, that Mr. Palgrave regards him,—enforcing order where there had been anarchy, ruling firmly, and yet with singular clemency; and causing the terrors of his name to extend beyond where his arm can reach.

We must pass over the description of Hā'yel, the capital of Shomer; nor can we stay for an excellent scene at the reception of the travellers by Seyf, the court chamberlain, where his disguise was all but detected by a Syrian of Damascus, who recognised him, and would have frustrated all his plans,—if not brought his life into actual danger,—by revealing his European



origin. Fortunately the humour of recognition passed on to other travelled members of the circle, and Mr. Palgrave was thus enabled to turn from the real acquaintance with a vacant stare, and bestow all his attention on the witness who professed to know his house in Cairo, where he lived in great wealth, with many other circumstances which admitted of a flat denial; till the man of Damascus was either outfaced or convinced into silence. He next has an audience with Telāl as this last returns from his afternoon walk.

"Here comes Telāl," said Seyf, in an undertone. The midmost figure was in fact that of the prince himself. Short of stature, broad-shouldered, and strongly built, of a very dusky complexion, with long black hair, dark and piercing eyes, and a countenance rather severe than open, Telāl might readily be supposed about forty years in age, though he is in fact thirty-seven or thirty-eight at most. His step was measured, his demeanour grave and somewhat haughty. His dress, a long robe of Cachemire shawl, covered the white Arab shirt, and over all he wore a delicately worked cloak of camel's hair from 'Omān, a great rarity and highly valued in this part of Arabia. His head was adorned by a brodered handkerchief, in which silk and gold thread had not been spared, and girt by a broad band of camel's hair entwined with red silk, the manufacture of Meshid 'Alee. A gold-mounted sword hung by his side, and his dress was perfumed with musk in a degree better adapted to Arab than to European nostrils. His glance never rested for a moment; sometimes it turned on his nearer companions, sometimes on the crowd; I have seldom seen so truly an "eagle eye" in rapidity and in brilliancy.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 110.

From the first, Mr. Palgrave had discovered his mistake in combining the business of a merchant, needing a bulky stock in trade, with the profession of a doctor, which should have been his sole calling, as most convenient for his real purpose. However, no calling comes amiss to some people; he had found it easy to dispose of his goods at a profit in the Djowf, and in Hā'yel set up as a regular practitioner. Not that he professes to have qualified for the profession, but probably what knowledge he had contrived to pick up set him so far above the native faculty, that he was justified in silencing any timid scruples. His plan was to refuse to prescribe for women and children altogether,—for obvious reasons, and also the less soon to exhaust his stock of drugs,—and to undertake no case in which he had reason to expect a fatal issue. In manner we cannot for a moment suppose Mr. Palgrave deficient, and with two huge folios of Arabic medicine for show, and a French and English *vade-mecum* behind his back for secret reference, we cannot but feel the invalids of Hā'yel in very good hands. The plan in that part of the world is to make a bargain with the patient beforehand—no cure no pay. Arabs as a rule, he says, exhibit a peculiarity of which we all know examples nearer home; they are close in driving a bargain, and open in down-

right giving. They will chaffer half a day about a penny, and throw away the worth of pounds on the first asker. He gives us the journal of one day (August, 1862) as a sample of many others during his stay in Hā'yel. After many patients of distinction, came a peasant; of which class, he says elsewhere, that the peasant is the same all over the world. The switch that he carries seems a universal resource for the hands with all Arabs throughout Arabia, settled or nomade. All the Bedouins carry a crooked camel-stick, with which they employ their fingers and give enforcement to their words.

'It is accordingly a stout clown from Mogah, scantily dressed in working wear, and who has been occupied for the last half-hour in tracing sundry diagrams on the ground before him with a thick peach-tree switch, thus to pass his time till his betters shall have been served. He now edges forward, and taking his seat in front of the door, calls my attention with an "I say, doctor." Whereon I suggest to him that his bulky corporation not being formed of glass or any other transparent material, he has by his position entirely intercepted whatever little light my recess might enjoy. He apologizes, and shuffles an inch or two sideways. Next I enquire what ails him, not without some curiosity to hear the answer, so little does the herculean frame before me announce disease. Whereto Do'eymis, or whatever may be his name, replies, "I say, I am all made up of pain." This statement, like many others, appears to me rather too general to be literally true. So I proceed in my interrogatory: "Does your head pain you?" "No." (I might have guessed that; these fellows never feel what our cross-Channel friends entitle, "*le mal des beaux esprits*.") "Does your back ache?" "No." "Your arms?" "No." "Your legs?" "No." "Your body?" "No." "But," I conclude, "if neither your head nor your body, back, arms, or legs pain you, how can you possibly be such a composition of suffering?" "I am all made up of pain, doctor," replies he, manfully entrenching himself within his first position. The fact is, that there is really something wrong with him, but he does not know how to localize his sensations. So I push forward my enquiries, till it appears that our man of Mogah has a chronic rheumatism; and on ulterior investigation, conducted with all the skill that Barakāt and I can jointly muster, it comes out that three or four months before he had an attack of the disease in its acute form, accompanied by high fever, since which he has never been himself again.

'This might suffice for the diagnosis, but I wish to see how he will find his way out of more intricate questions; besides, the townsmen sitting by, and equally alive to the joke with myself, whisper "Try him again." In consequence, I proceed with "What was the cause of your first illness?" "I say, doctor, its cause was God," replies the patient. "No doubt of that," say I; "all things are caused by God; but what was the particular and immediate occasion?" "Doctor, its cause was God, and secondly, that I ate camel's flesh when I was cold," rejoins my scientific friend. "But was there nothing else?" I suggest, not quite satisfied with the lucid explanation just given. "Then, too, I drank camel's milk; but it was all, I say, from God, doctor," answers he.

'Well, I consider the case, and make up my mind regarding the treatment. Next comes the grand question of payment, which must be agreed on beforehand, and rendered conditional on success, as my readers know. I enquire what he will give me on recovery. "Doctor," answers the

peasant, "I will give you, do you hear? I say, I will give you a camel." But I reply that I do not want one. "I say, remember God," which being interpreted here means, "do not be unreasonable; I will give you a fat camel, every one knows my camel; if you choose, I will bring witnesses, I say." And while I persist in refusing the proffered camel, he talks of butter, meal, dates, and suchlike equivalents.

'There is a patient and a paymaster for you. However, all ends by his behaving reasonably enough; he follows my prescriptions with the ordinary docility, gets well, and gives me for my pains an eighteenpenny fee.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 159, 160.

Having sought a private interview with Ṭelāl, and told him more than is communicated to the reader, the life of the travellers proved so agreeable in Hā'yel, that the desire to pursue their journey to less pleasant quarters caused some surprise, but it was essential to Mr. Palgrave's great object to penetrate to the Nejed, the heart of Arabia and of the Wahhabee faction, with whom he was already forming some acquaintance. Ṭelāl, as we have said, was liberal, and no way disposed to the severities of this party; but its power was such that even he did not venture to declare this bias. The sale of tobacco was carried on underhand; silk, the forbidden luxury, if worn at all, had to be largely mixed with cotton; and if Ṭelāl was not so constant as he ought to be at the mosque, he sanctioned in his uncle, 'Obeyd the wolf,' an excess of zeal. Much space is given to the character of this personage, a warrior, and a zealot after the most approved Wahhabee fashion. It was Ṭelāl's policy to employ his uncle as much as possible away from the capital, therefore the travellers had been established in Hā'yel some time before they came under the formidable eye of this reformer. After giving an account of his career, and of his close alliance with Feysul, king of the Nejed—

'Such was 'Obeyd, who now returned to the capital from a foray in which he had shown all the vigour and ferocity of youth, and found the Christian doctors established within its precincts. Had he been absolute lord and master here, our stay would not have been much prolonged. But aware of the favour we enjoyed at court and among the townsmen, he restrained himself; and where the wolf's skin was not long enough, eked it out with the fox's, after the prudent counsel of the Macedonian Philip.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 205.

The Arabs are a cautious race, and little as Mr. Palgrave's friends in Hā'yel liked 'Obeyd, they had not ventured on painting him in his true colours to the strangers. But, on their first meeting, our traveller was put on his guard by the 'cold look of the large 'grey eye, which seemed to belong to a different face, from its 'contrast with the rest of the features.' It was 'Obeyd's policy to be civil: he pressed hospitalities upon Mr. Palgrave, and affected a politic and impartial tone, in the midst of which gleams of the wolf would put his hearers on their guard. Finally, before

taking final leave, and on tendering a last shake of the hand, he gave them a letter of introduction to the eldest son of Feysul, to secure them a good reception at the Wahhabee capital. Of this he took the liberty to break the numerous seals, and found these words:—

‘I give it word for word; it ran thus: “In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate, We ‘Obeyd-ebn-Rasheed salute you, O ‘Abd-Allah son of Feysulebn-Sa‘ood. and peace be on you, and the mercy of God and His blessings.” (This is the invariable commencement of all Wahhabee epistles, to the entire omission of the complimentary formulas used by other Orientals.) “After which,” so proceeded the document, “we inform you that the bearers of this are one Seleem-el-Eys, and his comrade Barakât-esh-Shamee, who give themselves out for having some knowledge in”—here followed a word of equivocal import, capable of interpretation alike by “medicine” or “magic,” but generally used in Nejed for the latter, which is at Riad a capital crime. “Now may God forbid that we should hear of any evil having befallen you. We salute also your father Feysul, and your brothers, and all your family; and anxiously await your news in answer. Peace be with you.” Here followed the signet impression.’—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 209.

Only this was wanting to the extreme danger of their further journey, and to cause the ‘forfeit of their lives in the Nejdean man-trap.’ Instead of this document, they were, however, bearers of a safe pass from Telāl, who gave them much advice to be prudent and wary, but declined to furnish them with an introductory letter, as feeling himself under suspicion at Riad. He parted with them under the understanding of their returning to Hā’yel on their homeward way. In all these scenes we are impressed by the absolute civilization of the higher classes, their sense, judgment, and feeling of good society. Leaving these he plunges once more into the Desert, their only road to Kaseem and its capital BereyDAH. But all companies furnish Mr. Palgrave with material for amusing narrative, and no people are so removed from his sympathies but that he can read their characters and understand their aims. We are admitted now to an acquaintance with the motley materials of a caravan, consisting of ‘Bedouins, pilgrims, merchants, polite and intelligent men, and other quiet business-like folks absorbed in their own affairs, soon known, soon forgotten,’ and one a negro who furnishes a digression on the part his race play in Arabia. At a small village on their way he is a witness of the manner in which criminal causes are tried, and justice administered on slight offenders, a point on which Mr. Palgrave always speaks favourably. The Arabs seem to have more notion of justice than most oriental nations. They are unwilling to shed blood; their only form of execution is decapitation, which is not inflicted without full investigation, while in lighter cases their summary justice stands an example to more polished nations.

Of the perfumes of Arabia we do not hear so much as we might expect. He attributes the enthusiasm expressed in Arab poetry for the Nejed breeze to the fact that these versifiers, being probably inhabitants of the barren Hejāz, the western coast, are struck by contrast. Still, when the sweet smell of Rēnd, Khozāmāh, Themām and other aromatic thyme-like plants, mix with the morning breeze of this region, he owns to a wonderfully balmy influence. The country of Kaseem stands on a raised plateau intersected by valleys, half chalk, half sand. It contains about thirty thousand inhabitants, who live in a series of villages.

'Every hamlet is surrounded by a proportional extent of palm-groves, gardens, and fields, reaching not unfrequently far down the valley, like a long green streak on a yellow carpet, along a series of wells, which mark the direction of some underground watercourse. I was told that a new well opened to the east will often diminish the supply of a westerly source, a fact which may imply the general slope downwards of the continent in the latter direction.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 233.

What is remarkable here, is that the water 'always present, not on the surface but wherever wells are sunk,' is invariably indicated by small round mounds, diminutive hillocks, that simply act as water-marks without in any perceptible way contributing to the supply. These 'monticules,' for which Mr. Palgrave cannot account, are to be met with also in parts of Syria. In Kaseem, being still in Telāl's dominions, the journey was pursued under the most comfortable conditions, at the rate of fourteen hours a day,—five miles to the hour,—and sounds pleasant enough; even women could undertake it, and some are described in their large indigo dresses, as more like inanimate bundles taken to market than living beings. Nobody talked to them, and they of course talked to nobody. Large as Mr. Palgrave's curiosity was, it exercised itself very little in this field, nor does he inquire at all as to what goes on within the household. In Kaseem he comes upon a snug country house, where the whole party met with a hospitable reception, and which gives occasion for a passing remark:—

'Before long the members of the family who chanced to be at home, old and young, appeared one after another to pay their welcome, the women excepted, in whom such forwardness would be a breach of etiquette. For although the absolute seclusion which, it is well known, imprisons, physically and morally, the fair sex in orthodox Mahometan lands, is seldom if ever observed in Arabia, where women bear a great part in active life and domestic cares, keep shops, buy, sell, and sometimes even go to war; yet there is not the easy and straightforward mixture of society that distinguishes Europe; and the female portion of the household, though not absolutely in the dark, is yet under a kind of shade. Thus women, young or old (I mean, of course, elderly), never sit at table with the men of the family, rarely join in their pleasure meetings, and above all may not in

seemliness thrust themselves forward to welcome guests or strangers and converse with them. However, if one remains long enough to become in a manner part of the family, the ladies too end by growing more sociable, will now and then join in chat, and take interest in what is going on. Of course, in the dwellings of the poor, women and men all live together, and little separation is or can be kept up; a narrow home going far to bring its tenants on a level. But in richer families and chieftains' houses the women are bound to occupy a separate quarter, whence, however, curiosity or business often draws them forth into the apartments of the other sex. Nor is the covering veil, though generally worn, nearly so strict in obligation as in Syria or Egypt. It is matter of custom and of creed, and readily dispensed with when occasion requires. Indeed, in some parts of Arabia, 'Omān for instance, and its provinces, it is barely in use. Nor are Bedouin women apt to impose on their grimed and wizened faces a concealment that might on the whole be for their advantage. Among the rigid Wahhabees alone the veil and the harem acquire something like exactness, and there Arab liberty consents to inflict on itself something of the servitude of Islam.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 271, 272.

Further on he gives a scale of Arab feminine attractiveness, which comprehends pretty much all he has to say about the ladies, beyond an occasional hit at some good-natured, chattering, hag-like Bedouin.

'My fair readers will be pleased to learn that the veil and other restraints inflicted on the gentle sex by Islamic rigorism, not to say worse, are much less universal and more easily dispensed with in Ḥaṣa; while in addition the ladies of the land enjoy a remarkable share of those natural gifts which no institutions, and even no cosmetics, can confer; namely, beauty of face and elegance of form. Might I venture on the delicate and somewhat invidious task of constructing a "beauty-scale" for Arabia, and for Arabia alone, the Bedouin women would on this kalometer be represented by zero, or at most 1°; a degree higher would represent the female sex of Nejed; above them rank the women of Shomer, who are in their turn surmounted by those of Djowf. The fifth or sixth degree symbolizes the fair ones of Ḥaṣa; the seventh those of Kaṭar; and lastly, by a sudden rise of ten degrees at least, the seventeenth or eighteenth would denote the pre-eminent beauties of 'Omān. With Kaṭar and 'Omān we have yet to make acquaintance. Arab poets occasionally languish after the charmers of Hejāz; I never saw any to charm me, but then I only skirted the province. All bear witness to the absence of female loveliness in Yemen; and I should much doubt whether the mulatto races and dusky complexions of Ḥaḍramāut have much to vaunt of.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 177.

Mr. Palgrave has been likened to Herodotus for the number of his digressions. As we read we do not well know how this can be prevented, or the information he has to give be told in a more agreeable method. It is indeed almost inevitable when he has to inform his readers of so much entirely new to them. The course of events is nothing without its circumstances, and we need to be constantly put into possession of the whole situation. Thus, in approaching Nejed, the strong religious prejudices he was going to encounter suggest a defence of his own position, and the views of the world about him as to what is



Christianity. 'No one is bound to wear his heart upon his sleeve. No ; nor his creed either,' is his first statement in self-defence. Amongst Arabs in general it is unpolite to ask any questions about a man's faith or sect. 'Religion concerns God alone,' is the rule with all Arabs of polite education. With the Wahabee it is different ; and though he might not think it necessary to kill a Christian merely as such, he would be very likely to do it under the suspicion of proselytising, though after all with the very dimmest idea of the nature of the creed to which he manifests such active antipathy.

'A concluding remark on this subject, and I have done. I stated that the religion of a given stranger in these countries, though an avowed Christian, will not in itself and of itself compromise either his personal safety or the scope of his journey. Now few in Central Arabia have a clear idea of what Christians are : some suppose them to be simply a peculiar sect of Mahometans, others hold them for infidels ; some call them brothers, others stigmatize them as misbelievers. But the common feeling towards them is not unfavourable, except among the strictly Wahabee population, and even there they are better looked on than Jews, who have a most unfortunate reputation throughout Arabia. Nor is it rare to find among the Wahabees men of learning and knowledge, as learning and knowledge here go, who, in blissful ignorance of the world elsewhere, seriously believe that the whole universe, with all it contains of men and genii, has long since embraced the Mahometan faith, and consequently regard Christianity with a merely historical aversion, like what a theological professor might feel for the Assyrian or Greek mythology, nor dream that Christians yet exist to be objects of a more present hatred.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 266.

It is at Bereydah, in his way through Kaseem to Riad, that Mr. Palgrave falls in with the great caravan of Persian pilgrims returning from Medina by the road of Kaseem, headed by Mo-hammed-'Alee-esh-Shirāzee, the leader appointed from Teheran to conduct the vast stream through its perilous and difficult journey. There is something pathetic in the amount of imposition and downright pillage these pilgrims have to endure from one end of their course to the other. The passage of this annual caravan is an object of emulation among the rulers of Central Arabia, through some part of which it must make its way. Telāl had entered into negotiations with the Persian government to arrange a northern route through Hā'yel, but Fey-sul, the Wahabee autocrat, had secured the prize, the route through the Nejed being eight days shorter. The Wahabees, as orthodox, hate Shiyā'ee heretics with a deadly hatred, but—

'Feysul, overjoyed to draw this additional silver stream to his mill, waived the motives of bigotry and national hatred which had more than once led his predecessors to refuse the most advantageous offers when made by heretics. Indeed, "for a consideration" he would probably have furnished the Devil himself with passport, camel, and guide. Still he felt himself bound in conscience to make the unbelievers pay roundly for the negative good treatment which he thus consented to afford, and took his measures accordingly.

'Forty gold tomāns were fixed as the claim of the Wahhabee treasury on every Persian pilgrim for his passage through Riāḍ, and forty more for a safe-conduct through the rest of the empire; eighty in all. On his side Feyṣul was to furnish from among his own men a guide invested with absolute power in whatever regarded the special arrangement of the march, and we may without any breach of charity suppose that the king's servant could not do less than imitate the good example of his master in fleeing the heretics to the best of his ability. Every local governor on the way would naturally enough take the hint, and strive not to let the "enemies of God" (for this is the sole title given by Wahhabees to all except themselves) go by without spoiling them more or less. So that, all counted up, the legal and necessary dues levied on every Persian Shiya'ee while traversing Central Arabia and under Wahhabee guidance and protection, amounted, I found, to about one hundred and fifty gold tomāns, equalling nearly sixty pounds sterling English, no light expenditure for a Persian, and no despicable gain to an Arab.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 275, 276.

Nothing shows better Mr. Palgrave's Arab naturalisation than his antipathy to the Wahhabees, and the relish with which he represents the effects of their tenets on their manners. The unhappy Persians, thus fleeced according to law, had been further subject to private pillage; by dint of threats and bullying, carried to the extent of blows inflicted on Moḥammed 'Alee himself, the conductor of the band had got 'countless extras' out of his charge, and was now returning with them from Medina with 'saddle-bags loaded with tomāns, and camels with plunder.' But finding a nephew of Feyṣul's at Bereydaḥ, some fears seized him lest his victims should lodge such complaints against him as should lead to a forced refunding of his ill-gotten gains. A few bribes might have set all this right, but these Aboo-Boṭeyn could not make up his mind to give, so he took the course of running off with his booty, leaving justice and the Persian caravan alike in the lurch. It was at this juncture that Mr. Palgrave formed the acquaintance of the Commissioner Moḥammed which became intimate enough to result in an excellent portrait of a Persian gentleman, much reminding us of the ambassador in Haggi Baba. We have no space for the further rascalities practised on these unhappy dupes. It ended in Moḥammed deciding to go to head-quarters at Riāḍ, Feyṣul's capital, there to detail his manifold grievances. In the meanwhile, our travellers had been casting about for the means of reaching the same destination, for which a guide was necessary, and not easily found.

'The Central provinces of Nejed, the genuine Wahhabee country, is to the rest of Arabia a sort of lion's den, on which few venture and yet fewer return. "Hāḍa Nejed; men dakhelaha f'mā kharaj," "this is Nejed, he who enters it does not come out again," said an elderly inhabitant of whom we had demanded information; and such is really very often the case. Its mountains, once the fastnesses of robbers and assassins, are at the present day equally or even more formidable as the stronghold of fanatics

who consider every one save themselves an infidel or a heretic, and who regard the slaughter of an infidel or a heretic as a duty, at least a merit. In addition to this general cause of anticipating a worse than cold reception in Nejed, wars and bloodshed, aggression and tyranny, have heightened the original antipathy of the surrounding population into special and definite resentment for wrongs received, perhaps inflicted, till Nejed has become for all but her born sons doubly dangerous, and doubly hateful.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 284, 285.

Further, the task of introducing persons so open to suspicion, as Mr. Palgrave and his companions, into this den, rendered the guide's office still more difficult and dangerous; and, after looking about in vain, they were beginning to despair, when, as Mr. Palgrave says, 'Providence opened them a door,' in the person of one Aboo-Eysa, a guide of pilgrims to Mecca, a native of Aleppo, a veritable cosmopolitan, into whose history he enters at length, whose adventures remind one of the Arabian Nights, with a character to make all vicissitudes easy and natural. The first meeting will give our reader some insight into Mr. Palgrave's habit of keen speculation on all that comes before him:—

'Towards evening Aboo-Eysa arrived. He entered with the easy and quiet air of a gentleman, and at once joined in conversation without the smallest embarrassment. I was much at a loss to read his riddle; his manner was not that either of a townsman or of a Bedouin, of a Christian or of a Mahometan; it partook of all, yet belonged to none; a manly face, but marked with that half-feminine delicacy of expression which, for example's sake, may be noticed in the portraits of Nelson, Rodney, and some other distinguished men of the eighteenth century; intelligent speech, yet betraying considerable ignorance on many points of school education; a negligent display of dress and bearing; a dialect which at one moment reminded me of Syria, at another of Nejed, and sometimes of the desert; above all, a total absence of all the stereotyped phrases which fill up the blanks of conversation among even the least religious Mahometans—all contributed to puzzle me regarding the real origin and character of our intended guide. My readers, previously informed of what we only learnt afterwards and by degrees, can more easily understand in the chequered history of Aboo-Eysa the causes and explanation of these complicated features. Much, too, in the man was individual, and the result of natural disposition no less than of circumstances, indeed in spite of them. Certainly a roving life is no good school for probity in dealings, nor for delicate morality in private conduct. Yet Aboo-Eysa possessed both these qualities in a degree that drew on him the admiration of many, the derision of some, and the notice of all. No one had ever heard from his lips any of those coarse jests and *double entendres* so common even among the better sort of Arabs in their freer hours, and his life was of a no less exemplary correctness than his language. Not a suspicion of libertinism had ever attached itself to him, at home or on his journeys he was and always had been a faithful and (though wealthy) a monogamous husband. Equally known for unblemished honour in money transactions, he had never contested or delayed the payment of a debt, and his partners in business bore unanimous witness to his scrupulous fidelity,'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 294, 295.

In regard to religion, all sects, parties, and opinions, were to Aboo-'Eysa of equal esteem and honour. He had been all his life familiar with Jews, Christians, and Mahometans, and cared absolutely nothing about Sonnee or Shiya'ee,—'all were right and all were wrong'—views very convenient for Mr. Palgrave's object. It so chanced that this person was bound for his home at Hofhoof, near the Eastern coast, and must therefore pass through Nejed the dreaded territory, and gladly undertook to convey his new acquaintance thither, and, as it turned out in the end, 'the Na'ib' (the Persian commissioner's official title), also: who was thus for a long time thrown into close intimacy with our countryman. Here Mr. Palgrave enters upon a timely digression on the origin and founder of Wahhabeism, and the Islam idea of the Divinity. We can only cull here and there one out of his array of facts. To some of our readers it will not be unnecessary to explain that Mohammed-ebn-'Abd-el-Wahhab, founder of the sect, was born at Horeymelah, in the Nejed, somewhat before the middle of the last century, about the time, we suppose, that Methodism was taking root in England; we mention it as a coincidence not an analogy. His business as a merchant took him to Damascus, where he fell in with certain Sheykhs, strongly opposed to the abuses and vanities overgrowing pure Mahometanism.

'To the persevering doggedness and patient courage of his Nejdean countrymen, he added a power of abstraction and generalization rare among them; his eye was observant and his ear attentive, he had already seen much and reflected deeply. But the lessons of the Damascene sheykhs aided him to combine once for all, and to render precise, notions that he had long before, it seems, entertained in a floating and unsystematized condition. He now learned to distinguish clearly between the essential elements of Islam and its accidental or recent admixtures, and at last found himself in possession of what had been the primal view and starting-point of the Prophet and his first companions in Hejâz twelve ages before.

'To appreciate accurately and distinctly the innermost thoughts and purpose of the first founder of a sect at more than a thousand years' distance, and through all the complicated strata of orthodoxy and heterodoxy laid over it by parties and commentators, by times and races, is no easy task, nor is every eye capable of so keen a view, nor every mind of so comprehensive a grasp. This requires uncommon analytic and deductive power, with that intuitive tact which few possess, and which forms the basis of what men call genius in every science or art. Strength of will, nay, audacity itself, is no less needful too than strength of intellect. All these Mohammed-ebn-'Abd-el-Wahhâb united in eminent measure. To him is the praise, if praise it be, of having discovered amid the ruins of the Islamitic pile its neglected keystone, and, harder still, of having dared to form the project to replace it, and with it and by it reconstruct the broken fabric.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 364, 365.

This keystone is contained in the phrase 'La Ilâh illa Allâh,'

which in literal English means 'there is no god but God,' but in Arabic means much more.

"There is no god but God" are words simply tantamount in English to the negation of any deity save one alone; and thus much they certainly mean in Arabic, but they imply much more also. Their full sense is, not only to deny absolutely and unreservedly all plurality whether of nature or of person in the Supreme Being, not only to establish the unity of the Unbegetting and Unbegot, in all its simple and uncommunicable Oneness, but besides this the words, in Arabic and among Arabs, imply that this one Supreme Being is also the only Agent, the only Force, the only Act existing throughout the universe, and leave to all beings else, matter or spirit, instinct or intelligence, physical or moral, nothing but pure unconditional passiveness, alike in movement or in quiescence, in action or in capacity. The sole power, the sole motor, movement, energy, and deed, is God; the rest is downright inertia and mere instrumentality, from the highest archangel down to the simplest atom of creation. Hence, in this one sentence, "*La ilāh illa Allāh*," is summed up a system which, for want of a better name, I may be permitted to call the Pantheism of Force, or of Act, thus exclusively assigned to God, Who absorbs it all, exercises it all, and to Whom alone it can be ascribed, whether for preserving or for destroying, for relative evil or for equally relative good. I say "relative," because it is clear that in such a theology no place is left for absolute good or evil, reason or extravagance; all is abridged in the autocratical will of the one great Agent: "*sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas*;" or, more significantly still, in Arabic, "*Kemā yesha'o*," "as He wills it," to quote the constantly recurring expression of the Coran.—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 365.

After a longer passage than we can quote on the notion of the Deity conveyed by the Coran, he concludes with the testimony of tradition.

'But for the benefit of my readers in general, all of whom may not have drunk equally deep at the fountain-heads of Islamitic dogma, I will subjoin a specimen, known perhaps to many Orientalists, yet too characteristic to be here omitted, a repetition of which I have endured times out of number from admiring and approving Wahhabees in Nejed.

'Accordingly, when God—so runs the tradition; I had better said, the blasphemy—resolved to create the human race, He took into His hands a mass of earth, the same whence all mankind were to be formed, and in which they after a manner pre-existed; and having then divided the clod into two equal portions, He threw the one half into hell, saying, "These to eternal fire, and I care not;" and projected the other half into heaven, adding, "and these to Paradise, and I care not."—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 367.

Concluding his argument—

'All we are at present concerned with is that such is the pervading idea, the central figure, the master or mother thought, in brief, the key-stone of Islam, as Mahomet conceived it and as the Wahhabee understood it. Later doctrines and schools, introducing now free will, now merit, now hierarchical institutions and mutual dependence of man on man, now devising intercessors and mediators, living or dead, selecting holy places, honouring saints and tombs, framing ascetic brotherhoods and darweesh associations, were by the Wahhabee recognised henceforth in their true light, from his point of view, as innovations, corruptions, and distortions

of the great and simple vision of one solitary autocrat, over one even mass of undistinguished and undistinguishable slaves. . . .

'With the courage worthy of a great if not of a good cause, Moḥammed-ebn-'Abd-el-Wahhāb resolved to consecrate the remainder of his life to the restoration of this primæval image of Islam, the Islam of Mahomet, of the Ṣāḥḥabah, and now his own; convinced that this alone was the true, the unerring, the heaven-revealed path, and all beside it mere human super-addition and, in Lord Bacon's famous phrase, Idols of the Cave.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 370, 371.

Mr. Palgrave's greatest argument against the system, as opposed to the modifications of it that have grown out of man's better nature, is the Wahhabite character, and the state of society at Riāḍ. This city, in the province of 'Aared, and capital of the Nejed, he approached by a ruined town, containing the most bigoted fanatics 'that even 'Aared can offer,' and where his guide dare not rest a night with his company of 'Persians and Syrians, Shiya'ees and Christians,' for here an unhappy European, who had penetrated so far under the disguise of a Darweesh (we would willingly write Dervish if new fashions allowed us), expiated his rashness by his life. His disguise was detected; news of his approach was reported to Feysul, who lured him into the capital, entertained him, forwarded him on his journey, and procured his assassination by the men of this town Derey'eeeah.

In Riāḍ, all the austerities of Wahhabecism are in full force, and the liberalism and easy living natural to the Arab hides itself under an outward conformity. Not a shred of silk is to be seen in any man's attire; not a whiff of tobacco taints the air; not a soul dare be absent from daily prayer; not a mosque has a minaret; not a laugh is heard; not a child dare play in the streets. The occasion for first inflicting this terrorism on the inhabitants of Riāḍ was found in the breaking out of cholera in 1854 or 1855 (precise accuracy in chronology, he tells us, is utterly hopeless), which fell on the Nejed like a thunder-bolt, and carried off one third of the inhabitants of Riāḍ in a few weeks. The Wahhabees attributed this scourge to the vengeance of heaven on the falling away from Islam in its pureness; to wearing silk clothing, and especially to indulgence in 'the shameful.' The only remedy was a speedy reform. A council was convened by Feysul—

'The elders of the town retired, held long consultation, and returning, proposed the following scheme, which received the kingly ratification. From among the most exemplary and zealous of the inhabitants twenty-two were to be selected, and entitled "Meddey'yeeyah" "men of zeal," or "Zelators," such being the nearest word in literal translation, and this I shall henceforth employ, to spare Arab cacophony. Candidates of the requisite number were soon found and mustered. On these twenty-two Feysul conferred absolute power for the extirpation of whatever was con-



trary to Wahabee doctrine and practice, and to good morals in general, from the capital firstly, and then from the entire empire. No Roman censors in their most palmy days had a higher range of authority or were less fettered by all ordinary restrictions. Not only were these Zelators to denounce offenders, but they might also in their own unchallenged right inflict the penalty incurred, beat and fine at discretion, nor was any certain limit assigned to the amount of the mulct, or to the number of the blows. Most comprehensive too was the list of offences brought under the animadversion of these new censors; absence from public prayers, regular attendance five times a day in the public mosques being henceforth of strict obligation; smoking tobacco, taking snuff, or chewing (this last practice, vulgarly entitled "quidding," had been introduced by the jolly tars of Koweyt and other seaports of the Persian Gulf); wearing silk or gold; talking or having a light in the house after night prayers, singing or playing on any musical instrument; nay, even all street games of children or childish persons: these were some of the leading articles on the condemned list, and objects of virtuous correction and severity. Besides, swearing by any other name save that of God, any approach to an invocation, or even ejaculation directed to aught but Him; in short, whatever in word or deed, in conversation or in conduct, might appear to deviate from the exact orthodoxy of the letter of the Coran and the Wahabee commentary, was to be denounced, or even punished on the spot. Lastly, their censorship extended over whatever might afford suspicion of irregular conduct; for instance, strolling about the streets after nightfall, entering too frequently a neighbour's house, especially at hours when the male denizens may be presumed absent, with any apparent breach of the laws of decorum or decency; all these were rendered offences amenable to cognizance and correctional measures. It is easy to imagine what so wide-reaching a power might become when placed in the hands of interested or vindictive administrators. However, the number of the Zelators themselves, and the innate toughness and resistance of the Arab character, somewhat diminished the ill consequences which might naturally have been expected from this over-absolute and scarce-defined authority, though many and most atrocious instances of its exercise and abuse were related in my hearing.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 408, 409.

These Zelators, in a dress of absolute plainness, bearing a wand, at once as a staff of office and an instrument of chastisement, with downcast eyes, grave demeanours, and texts from the Coran for ever in their mouths, pace the streets, and enter any house they choose.

'If there is anything incorrect going on there, they do not hesitate to inflict at once, and without any preliminary form of trial or judgment, the penalty of stripes on the detected culprit, be he who he may; and should their own staves prove insufficient, they straightway call in the assistance of bystanders or slaves, who throw the guilty individual prone on the ground, and then in concert with the Zelator belabour him at pleasure. A similar process is adopted for those whom negligence has kept from public prayer; the Zelator of the quarter, accompanied by a band of the righteous, all well armed with stout sticks, proceeds to the designated dwelling, and demands an entrance, which no one dares refuse. It is then a word and a blow, or rather many blows and few words, till the undevout shortcomer is quickened into new fervour by the most cogent of all *à posteriori* arguments. Should he happen to be absent from home at the moment of the visit, nay, sometimes even after the administration of the healing chastise-

ment, a pledge for future good conduct, as a cloak, a sword, a head-dress, or the like is taken from the house, nor restored till several days of punctual attendance at the Mesjid have repaired the scandal of past negligence, and proved the sincerity of the conversion by its perseverance. But should any rash individual attempt to resist force by force, he may be sure of the roughest treatment; and should he lift his hand against the sacred person of the Zelator, the sacrilegious member is destined to the block and the knife. However, where direct mutilation or capital punishment is due, for instance, in a case of avowed and formal heresy or infidelity, the crime is referred to the tribunal of Feysul himself, nor does he fail to prosecute the culprit with the utmost rigour.—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 410, 411.

We gather that some of the first rigour of the ordinance had passed off at the time of Mr. Palgrave's visit; at any rate, the attempt to enforce it in all its strictness in the more distant parts of Feysul's dominions had met sometimes with a check, and now and then with open defiance, the ardour of a Zelator having, on one occasion at least, been allayed by a sound ducking, so that in these districts a tacit compromise took place. Dresses were tolerated of which a third part was silk; tobacco-vendors hid themselves out of sight, and were winked at; while smoking was only punishable in the public streets, and the roll-call of names, which in Riad is the mode for securing daily attendance at the mosque, was not ventured upon. Of the city itself he writes, though the first fury is over.—

‘Meanwhile I might almost leave my readers to suppose in what light such a body, and those who compose it, are regarded by the mass of the population. Surrounded with all the deference and all the odium consequent on their office and character, they meet everywhere with marks of open respect and covert distrust and hatred. Are a circle of friends met in the freedom of conversation, let a Zelator enter, their voices are hushed; and when talk is resumed, it follows a tack in which the recording angels of Islam themselves would find nothing to modify. Are a bevy of companions walking gaily with too light a gait down the street, at the meeting of a Zelator, all compose their pace, and direct their eyes in momentary modesty on the ground. Is a stealthy lamp lighted at unreasonable hours, at a rap on the shutters suspected for that of the Zelator, the “glim is doused,” and all is silent in darkness. Or, worse than all, is the forbidden pipe sending up its sinful fumes in some remote corner? at the fatal tap on the outer door, the unholy implement is hastily emptied out into the hearth, and then carefully hidden under the carpet, while every one hurries to wash his mouth and mustachios, and by the perfume of cloves or aromatic herbs give himself an orthodox smell once more. In short, schoolboys caught out by a severe under-master at an illicit prank, pious ladies surprised in reading the last French novel, or teetotallers suddenly discovered with a half-empty black bottle and tumbler on the table, never look more awkward, more silly, and more alarmed than Nejdeans on these occasions when a Zelator comes upon them.’—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 413, 414.

With regard to the prohibition of tobacco, the question naturally arises, why, since Mahomet could not have forbidden its use, simply because he did not know its existence, should those who follow his rule implicitly, place the practice of smoking fore-

most in the catalogue of sins. That they do so is plain from the report of a conversation held by our author with a certain 'Abd-el-Kereem, a bitter Wahhabee, and learned in the law, on the subject of 'great' and 'little sins.' 'What,' he had asked, 'is the first of the great sins?' and the reply was, 'Giving 'divine honours to a creature.'

"Of course," I replied, 'the enormity of such a sin is beyond all doubt. But if this be the first, there must be a second; what is it?'

"Drinking the shameful," in English, "smoking tobacco," was the unhesitating answer.

"And murder, and adultery, and false witness?" I suggested.

"God is merciful and forgiving," rejoined my friend: that is, these are merely little sins.

"Hence two sins alone are great, polytheism and smoking," I continued, though hardly able to keep countenance any longer. And 'Abd-el-Kereem with the most serious asseveration replied that such was really the case.—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 10, 11.

The alleged ground of objection is founded on a law, not of the Coran, but of tradition, which reports that Mahomet forbid his followers to employ in food whatever had been burnt or singed with fire. This may possibly be the reason that all meat is boiled in Arabia, while in the Nejed there is a total exclusion of all that is roasted, grilled, or fried. The defence, however, is weak, but Mr. Palgrave considers that the spirit of Islam is with the prohibitors, and that probably had Mahomet known tobacco, he would have forbidden it on account of what he, as a smoker, considers its eminently social qualities.

Though the corporal inflictions of the Zelators on recusants of all grades, not excepting the king's own brother, would argue a somewhat rude state of things where the graces of society could hardly flourish, yet Mr. Palgrave assures us of a certain elegance and polish of manners in the capital of the Wahhabees. This 'Abd-el-Kereem was eminent in this particular, though, as a bitter Wahhabee and model of the orthodox vices of the sect, no favourite with his countrymen or with our author. His first acquaintance with Mr. Palgrave was in the capacity of patient, and as such he was welcomed as the very man, from his extensive information and power of expressing his opinions, to further the real object of his journey. Our friend was so fortunate as to understand his case, and after three weeks of constant visits he announced himself perfectly well. At the outset of the treatment a fee had been agreed upon in case of cure, and on his recovery his doctor ventured to remind his patient of the engagement. Hint after hint followed, 'each one broader than its predecessor,' and all to no purpose, till the affair became known to a large circle of the most respectable inhabitants of Riad, who one and all showed a marked curiosity as to how the matter would end.

The whole sum did not exceed eleven English shillings. 'Abd-el-Kereem was well to do, but he would willingly have shirked payment, and was observed to be casting about for expedients to do so.

'I was seated alone in my K'hāwah, somewhat late in the afternoon, when a brisk knock at the door warned me to stop my note-writing and to undo the latch. In came three or four of my town friends, with the merry faces of men who have a good jest to tell, and had hardly seated themselves before they began to relate what they had just witnessed. They had arrived from the daily afternoon sermon at the Great Mosque or Djāmia'. While yet at Hā'yel I mentioned this kind of discourse; here there is no essential difference, unless that the ceremony is much longer, the audience more numerous, and the lecture or sermon turns twice out of three times on some peculiarity of the sect. On the present occasion, when the reader, a Meṭow'waa', had finished his part, 'Abd-el-Kereem came forward to deliver the vivâ voce commentary, here never omitted. Our friend took for theme of his discourse, the inefficacy of created means, and the obligation of placing one's confidence in the Creator alone, to the exclusion of the creature. Thence coming to a practical application, he inveighed against those who put their trust in physic and physicians, not in God solely, and declared such trust to be, firstly, heretical, and, secondly, a sheer mistake, inasmuch as the only effective cause of health or sickness, life or death, is simply the Divine will; doctors and medicine being for nothing in the matter from beginning to end. Whence he deduced a second and a very legitimate consequence, that such useless things and beings could nohow merit any recompense either in money or in thanks from a true believer. Nay, added he, should even a sick man really seem to be bettered by medical means, and while employing them recover his health, such a recovery would be a mere coincidence, no matter of cause and effect, and the doctor would in consequence be entitled to absolutely nothing, since the cure was due not to him, but to God alone, La Ilāh illa Allāh, &c.

Probably, at another moment and from another mouth, these lessons of theologico-practical wisdom would have passed without other comment than silence or approbation. But unluckily 'Abd-el-Kereem was a conspicuous character, and so was I. Every neighbour knew the whole history of his ailment, his physicking, and his cure, by heart. The result was, that his holding forth, although perfectly orthodox in itself, lay under the imputation of private nor over-honourable feelings, and every one suspected the preacher to be engaged rather in knotting his own purse-strings than in untying the plexus of a doctrinal question. Winks and nods went round; and, when the auditors were once out of the mosque, followed comments and what laughter might be compatible with Nejdean decorum. My friends enjoyed the joke heartily, and in conclusion promised to bring 'Abd-el-Kereem by one means or another to our house next day, while we agreed together on what should then be said and done.

They kept promise, and in the following forenoon 'Abd-el-Kereem appeared with an embarrassed look, and surrounded by several companions, amongst whom were those of the preceding evening. After the preliminaries of courtesy, and conversation having reached the desired point, "Abd-el-Kereem," said I, "there can be no doubt that health and recovery come from God alone, and small thanks to the doctor. In the same manner, neither more nor less, I expect that God will give me so much" (naming the stipulated sum) "by your passive instrumentality, and when I have got it, small thanks to you also." Every one laughed, and fell on our poor

ex-Zelator, till he became thoroughly ashamed of himself. He left the house with promise of speedy payment, and before sunset his younger brother had brought the money in question, thus preventing further sarcasms. But 'Abd-el-Kereem never crossed our threshold again, nor did we much regret him.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 16—18.

Such scenes as these show Mr. Palgrave very much at home in his strange quarters. His Persian friend, the Nā'ib, was scarcely as equal to all occasions that should arise, or as fortunate. Amongst the doctor's nominal patients was 'Abd-Allah, the son and heir of Feysul, in person like the portraits of Henry VIII. and in character not dissimilar. Of this person the Nā'ib sought an interview.

'Meanwhile both Maḥboob and 'Abd-Allah made fun of the old Nā'ib to their heart's content; and he too in his turn fleeced at them. The Persian, finding Feysul hopelessly cold in his cause, resolved on a visit to his son and heir, and having arrayed himself in all his finery, called at the prince's palace. When introduced into the K'hāwah, he found 'Abd-Allah stretched out on the carpet Bedouin-fashion, back uppermost, with a cushion under his elbows to prop him up, and much in the position of a dog when he puts his muzzle on his fore-paws and looks at you. "Welcome," said the gracious prince to the approaching ambassador, and motioned him to sit down, without the while changing his own unceremonious posture. Then, after a minute of staring, "Is your beard dyed?" was the first princely question. I should say that staining the hair is looked on by Wahhabees as an unlawful encroachment on the rights of the Creator to bestow on His creatures whatever colouring He chooses. The Nā'ib in a grave but somewhat vexed tone allowed that his beard was dyed, and asked what was the matter even if it were? "Because," replied 'Abd-el-Allah, "we consider such a practice to be highly improper." Whereto the Nā'ib drily answered, that the Persians thought otherwise. "Are you a Sonnee or a Shiya'ee?" next inquired the reclining majesty. The Nā'ib's patience, always scant, was now at an end. "I am Shiya'ee, and my father was a Shiya'ee, and my grandfather was a Shiya'ee, and we are all Shiya'ees," answered he in a tone of downright passion; "but you, 'Abd-Allah, what are you, a prince or a chaplain?" The whole in that broken Arabic which rendered anger impossible. "A prince," replied 'Abd-Allah, looking very big. "Because," rejoined the Persian, "I thought from your questions you were a chaplain; and if you are indeed so, get you off to the mosque; that is the place, not a palace, for one who talks in your style." 'Abd-Allah burst out laughing, and made an apology worse than the fault, by pretending ignorance of diplomatic usages and the respect due to ambassadors, and then changed the discourse. All this was nohow real levity or clownishness in the Nejde; his insolence was the result of cool and deliberate calculation, designed to bring the Persian down to the right point for the bargain already resolved on by Feysul and his son. The Nā'ib came away in a fury against the Bedouin, and Abou-Eysa had much ado to prevent his leaving the capital in a huff that very day.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 102, 103.

Things went from bad to worse. Even the Zelators instituted inquiries at his house, and attempted to beat his servants. At length it was made clear to the Nā'ib that nothing would expedite matters but a bribe. Unwillingly, he had to send his double-

barrelled fowling-piece to 'Abd-Allah, a ruby to Feyṣul, and other gifts elsewhere. The effect was magical. Apologies for past accidents showered in, and the affair ended. Some presents were given in return, and the Nā'ib was so far propitiated as to promise for his government that the pilgrims should still pursue the Nejed route.

'It was a scoundrelly business from beginning to end, and did little honour either to the merchandising Sultan of Nejed and his subordinates, or to the Persian who deliberately sold his countrymen's rights and the interests of his government for an old horse, an old camel, and some old cloaks.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 107.

Mr. Palgrave's stay in Riāḍ was some six or eight weeks,—long enough for his purpose. But if it is hard to enter Riāḍ, it is harder still to leave it. We have not space, however, to detail how the departure was effected; but his final transactions with 'Abd-Allah were not of a nature to allow of delay. This worthy had a brother whom he hated with Oriental hatred. In his intercourse with the doctor he had become acquainted with the properties of strychnia, and conceived the idea of getting rid of his enemy by its means. The day for Mr. Palgrave's departure was fixed. He sent for him, and begged him to leave some of so excellent a medicine in his hands. In reply, he was assured that the drug was too dangerous for unskilled hands to administer, but from day to day his insistence became more importunate, till at length—

'I looked round to assure myself that we could not be overheard, and when a flat denial on my part had been met by an equally flat rejection and a fresh demand, I turned right towards him, lifted up the edge of his head-dress, and said in his ear, "'Abd-Allah, I know well what you want the poison for, and I have no mind to be an accomplice to your crimes, nor to answer before God's judgment-seat for what you will have to answer for. You shall *never* have it.'"—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 117.

After this, Mr. Palgrave and his friend, guided by the same Aboo-'Eysa, had nothing to do but to leave the city as quietly as they could—a city of which he thus speaks:—

'Meanwhile poor morality fares little better in this pharisaical land than in Burns's Kilmarnock, or Holy Fair. True, lights are extinguished an hour or so after sunset, and street-walking rigorously inhibited; while in the daytime not even a child may play by the roadside; not a man laugh out. True, profane instruments of music disturb not the sacred hum of Coranic lectures, and no groups of worldly mirth offend serious eyes in the market-place. But profligacy of all kinds, even such as language refuses to name, is riper here than in Damascus and Seyda themselves, and the comparative decency of most other Arab towns sets off the blackness of Riāḍ in stronger and stranger contrast.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 24.

He now plunges once more into the Desert, here a branch of the Nefood or Dahna, which extends over so enormous a tract



of southern Central Arabia. But we must pursue his course no further, however unwilling we are to leave many subjects of importance untouched, and many descriptions bringing new scenes vividly before our fancy. Graphic as his pen is, it is, after all, impossible, in so new a state of things, to form a consistent conception of this new world, and to reconcile opposites. With Mr. Palgrave's power of finding some points of sympathy wherever he goes, and something in common with whomsoever he finds himself, we are perhaps led to form too high an opinion of Central Arabian civilization—an opinion which receives a frequent shock; as, for instance, when we are told that the inhabitants of the Nejed, in their glorious ignorance of geography and statistics, very commonly imagine Mahometanism universal throughout the world; and that, knowing Europe to be Christian, they conceive this Europe to be one town, neither more nor less, within whose mural circuit seven kings conduct political affairs under the order of the Sultan. One might naturally suppose such people savages; but everything they say is expressed so well, and in such elegant Arabic, people dressed in rags are often so eloquent, that our views on the subject of civilization become confused and disturbed. It is, perhaps, consistent with such contradictions, that 'envy should be the plague-spot of the Arabs,' as he implies it to be of all Mahometan races. They have refinement enough to appreciate things beyond their reach. A writer so gifted to enter the heart of what he sees, to throw himself in the human interests in which he finds himself, cannot, as we have said, fail of some prejudices; we might, perhaps, judge differently in some cases, were we on the spot, but the extent of research and the amount of positive information on the face of the country, its history, politics, and natural features—the manners, habits, characteristics of its inhabitants—their religion, language, modes of thinking, their humours, interests, antipathies, and the local colouring thrown over all, are something wonderful to be the tale of one man's experience. We must now conclude with one extract, as an introduction to our second picture of Arab life.

'The European public is deluged with accounts of Arab customs, Arab ways, Arab qualities, houses, dresses, women, warriors, and what not; the most part from materials collected in Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, 'Irāk, perhaps Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco; or at the best in Djiddah and on the Red Sea coast. Sometimes a romantic spirit will furnish scenes among the hybrid Bedouins of Palmyra as portraits of Arab life; sometimes we are invited to study Arab society in a divan at Cairo or Aleppo. Such narratives, however accurate they may be for the localities and races they describe, have not an equal claim to the title of correct delineations of Arabs and of Arab customs. The case appears to me much as if the description of a backwoodsman of Ohio should be given for a faithful portrait of a Yorkshire farmer, or the ways and doings of Connaught for a

sketch of Norfolk life and manners. Syria and Egypt, Palmyra and Bagdad, even less Mosoul and Algiers, are not Arabia, nor are their inhabitants Arabs. The populations alluded to are instead a mixture of Curdes, Turcomans, Syrians, Phœnicians, Armenians, Berbers, Greeks, Turks, Copts, Albanians, Chaldeans, not to mention the remnants of other and older races, with a little, a very little Arab blood, one in twenty at most, and that little rediluted by local and territorial influences. That all more or less speak Arabic is a fact which gives them no more claim to be numbered among Arabs, than speaking bad English makes an Englishman of a native of Connaught or of Texas. For the popular figure of the Bedouin, I must add, that even were he sketched, as he rarely is, from the genuine nomade of Arabia, it would be no juster to bring him forward as an example of Arab life and society, than to publish the "Pickwick Papers," or "Nicholas Nickleby," with "Scenes in High Life," or "Tales of the Howards," on the back. These unlucky and much-talked-of Bedouins in the Syrian, also mis-called Arabian, desert, are in fact only hybrids, crosses between Turcoman and Curdish tribes, with a small and questionable infusion of Arab blood, and that too none of the best, like a wine-glass of thin claret poured into a tumbler of water. In short, among these races, town or Bedouin, we have no real authentic Arabs. Arabia and Arabs begin south of Syria and Palestine, west of Bagrah and Zobeyr, east of Kerak and the Red Sea. Draw a line across from the top of the Red Sea to the top of the Persian Gulf; what is below that line is alone Arab: and even then do not reckon the pilgrim route, it is half Turkish; nor Medina, it is cosmopolitan; nor the sea-coast of Yemen, it is Indo-Abyssinian; least of all Mecca, the common sewer of Mahometans of all kinds, nations, and lands, and where every trace of Arab identity has long since been effaced by promiscuous immorality and the corruption of ages. Mascot and Kaṭeef must also stand with Mokha and 'Aden on the list of exceptions.'—*Ibid*, vol. ii. pp. 162, 163.

We think it probable that Mr. Palgrave would have something to say of Lady Duff Gordon's Arabs, as also of the reproduction of Scripture scenes, as she fancies she sees them, on the banks of the Nile. It is certainly a coincidence that the books came out together, and that the lady's Muslim enthusiasm can be so readily compared with and qualified by Mr. Palgrave's profounder disquisitions on the theology of Islam, as also her lenient view of the social institutions, and of the manners growing out of the system, with the opposite conclusions his larger experience and wider field of observation have arrived at. A leading organ of liberalism has, however, in something between jest and earnest, pronounced the lady on this point the better judge of the two. Let a woman be only liberal enough, and she will always find some to pronounce her pre-eminently adapted, by position and organization, to arrive at truth. It is only those women who walk in the old paths who are reminded of their intellectual inferiority by the school of modern philosophy. Lady Duff Gordon is not only boastfully compared with the 'pious British female,' on account of her freedom from prejudice on such matters as harem life and polygamy, but is considered an especially competent judge of the whole question; while the British female generally, the woman who defers to

authority, who thinks anything wrong because she has been taught so, or because it jars upon her nature and instincts, is becoming more and more a mark for the derision of our new lights. Every belief that is accepted without question is laid to her door. Only the other day we read of her inconsistent horror of murder. 'Old ladies,' we are told, 'will talk by the hour of the sinfulness of extinguishing life which God has kindled, though they are taking vigilant measures every day to poison flies and cockroaches.' In fact, 'the old woman,' 'the British female,' is supposed to be the only person who takes anything for granted—the one outwork against the advances of modern liberalism,—the only one who resists the encroachment of new ideas, or thinks anything sacred and not to be disputed. Lady Duff Gordon is the opposite of all this, and is welcomed accordingly. She is far in advance even of Miss Martineau, who 'has spoken strongly against harem life;' whereas Lady Duff Gordon finds a great deal to say for it, at least for the man's share in it. Now no one can fairly stigmatize Miss Martineau as a British female; but then, as it is suggested in the same quarter, she *is* an old maid, and what can an old maid know of such things? and who receives her as a judge of conjugal relations?

Probably no English female writer of our day has thrown aside more entirely the reserve that has hitherto been considered the fitting veil to certain subjects, than the writer of this volume. Her mother, Mrs. Austin, who edits it, and has selected the letters, is so far aware of this, as to take what blame any one may choose to attach to this line on herself; but this only extends the number of unprejudiced British females. There are more ladies than we thought of who are disposed to consider all reserve as a mere matter of custom and habit, and as having no intrinsic ground or rule; and who treat the whole subject of propriety, not as depending on what is innately fit or unfit for publicity and discussion, what is essentially undesirable to make topics of common talk, but as matter to be determined by the prudery or the convenience of each community. If the ladies of a harem in Constantinople or Cairo say things that shock their strange visitors, they, in their turn, blush to hear an Englishwoman talk of her husband, and therefore are quits, the one party as scrupulous as the other. In fact, when an Englishwoman enters into such topics as these it is necessarily from the man's point of view. She scarcely attempts to enter into the mind of the ignorant women, whose whole life is a thing out of her sympathies. Lady Duff Gordon at least knows what she knows from the conversation of the men about her, whom she represents as the most

respectable of their class ; over some she throws quite a romantic interest. As far as their dim sense of propriety could guide them we are willing to suppose that their strange confidences were bestowed in all respect for the kind lady who cultivated their friendship, and trusted herself so fearlessly among them ; a woman, yet showing nothing in common with the childish, loud-talking, often scolding wife or wives at home, from whom our informant gathers that the husband suffers patiently aggravations that would try an Englishman's temper. But men being her informants, it follows that the defence of harem life is the men's part in it, not without a reference to the question of woman's rights, or rather wrongs, in Christian countries.

Our readers probably know enough of the present writer of these amusing letters, not to need informing that the search after health obliged the writer to seek a hot climate. She could not, we are told, live in England, and certainly she seems to thrive in heat unendurable to most English constitutions. Lady Duff Gordon being connected with the English Consul at Alexandria, many facilities came in her way ; but indeed a large, influential circle of friends made things easy of accomplishment, and probably rendered her secure in situations that a woman less in the world would be unwise to venture into. We cannot but admire the courage and resource that show themselves on all demands for them, while the letters themselves are a guarantee for unusual powers of mind, powers that tell and make their way in all countries under the sun. Lady Hester Stanhope, who also succeeded in Oriental life, though by less winning methods, argued for her position, that 'to command is to be truly great, to have talents is to talk without books in one's hand, and to have manners is to accommodate oneself to the customs and taste, of others, and to make them either fear or love you.' Such talents and such manners belong to the lady before us, and also the same consciousness of possessing them, probably, quite as indispensable in a solitary existence among alien races. Lady Duff Gordon not only is kind, but she knows she is kind, sympathizing, and indulgent. The contrast of her own tender consideration and sympathy for the difficulties, pains, and pleasures of the Arabs and Copts among whom she finds herself with the too common English insolence, is perpetually present to her—a perpetual gratification ; and their gratitude and affection, which she paints in such glowing colours, a satisfaction of which she never wearies. For a woman who has known the stir and charm of a brilliant London Society, this power of throwing herself into Egyptian life, this contentment in the society of the 'county families' about Thebes, proves a very remarkable strength of

character and sufficiency for herself. Thus sustained, there are no doubt attractions in the position of always conferring small obligations, and receiving rapturous thanks in return. To many of these poor people she might well represent one of those old divinities, from the worship of which neither Christianity nor Islamism, according to her showing, has entirely estranged them.

In return for their good opinion, Lady Duff Gordon does her best to reverse the received notion of the Egyptian Arab and even Copt, though her heart is more with the Mahometan population than the Christian. Nor are we disposed to dispute her more favourable judgment beyond the necessary allowances for temperament, and an obvious propensity to turn all her geese into swans. We can understand the corrupting influence of the European stream of travellers, and accept her assurance that the invariable clamour for baksheesh is to be heard only in the main current. There can, indeed, be no other inducement than a tenderness resulting from mutual esteem and kind offices, for her zealous defence of this traduced people. No one can be thrown among new people and be left dependent on them for society and comfort for long months at a time, and be wholly mistaken in a *good* estimate formed. Even if too favourable, if some grave errors are winked at, the blindness is caused by something amiable and winning as a set-off. Nothing makes Lady Duff Gordon so angry as the English faith in the stick as the only argument; she, reasonably enough, thinks that the extortion they are subject to is a very fair retribution. For herself, she is never weary of describing the disinterested devotion of her factotum, Omar, to her service. When first engaged, and when he supposed her rich, it is true he cared not at what cost he supported her dignity; but when she explained to him that 'the bey,' her husband, had only his pay and no baksheesh, he was as economical for her as for himself, and made her money go four times as far as that of the Englishman under the charge of a dragoman. This treasure, Omar, was recommended to her through the American Consul, and must be the envy of all her readers. So devoted, so respectful, so full of resource, so economical as a steward, so excellent a cook, so up in the language and sentiments of the country, so perfect in every way, and withal so delighted to lavish all these gifts in her service at half the wages he could have got elsewhere. So heartily did he enter into her desire to see and understand everything in this new world, that he devised a scheme of disguising her as his mother, and taking her the pilgrimage to Mecca. So peerless was he in his fidelity, that it even answered to listen to his estimate of his mistress behind her back. The J— men—

tioned in the following extract is, we gather, Lady Duff Gordon's daughter:—

'I heard Selem Efendi and Omar discussing English ladies one day lately, while I was inside the curtain with Selem's slave-girl, and they did not know I heard them. Omar described J——, and was of opinion that a man who was married to her could want nothing more. "By my soul she rides like a Bedawee, she shoots with the gun and pistol, rows the boat; she knows many languages and what is in these books; works with the needle like an Efreet, and to see her hands run over the teeth of the music-box (keys of the piano) amazes the mind while her singing gladdens the soul. How then should her husband ever desire the coffee-shop? Wallahee! she can always amuse him at home, and as to my lady the thing is not that she does not know. When I feel my stomach tightened, I go to the divan and say to her, 'Do you want anything—a pipe, or the sherbet, or so-and-so,' and I talk till she lays down her book and talks to me, and I question her and amuse my mind; and, by God! if I were a rich man, and could marry one English hareem like these I would stand before her and serve her like her Memlook. You see I am only this lady's servant, and I have not once sat in the coffee-shop, because of the sweetness of her tongue. Is it not true, therefore, that the man who can marry such hareem is rich more than with money?"

'Selem seemed disposed to think a little more of good looks, though he quite agreed with all Omar's enthusiasm, and asked if J—— was beautiful. Omar answered with decorous vagueness that she was a "moon," but declined mentioning her hair, eyes, &c. (It is a liberty to describe a woman minutely.) I nearly laughed out at hearing Omar relate his manœuvres to make me amuse his mind. It seems I am in no danger of being discharged for being dull; on the other hand, Frenchified Turks have the greatest detestation of *femmes d'esprit*.'—*Letters from Egypt*, p. 231.

One reason why everything was so bright to this lady is no doubt the congeniality of the climate and the healthy effects of great heat which, instead of disabling, seemed to bring out her powers. This might dispose her to see all things *couleur de rose*, but no allowances can materially detract from the value of the facts she records in favour of these much abused and much persecuted Fellaheen! There is a warmth in her pity and tenderness for their sufferings under the wanton misgovernment of their rulers, and an energy of indignation against their oppressors that are both catching. The fact that an English lady can live safe and respected, never cheated or imposed upon, for months together at Thebes, tells well for the inhabitants. They could appreciate the advantage of such a presence among them, and not abuse it. She, on her side, is never tired of commending the beauty and grace that surrounds her. The perfect Nubian figures, the fine faces, the dark velvet brown skins, or the reproduction—amongst other of the forms about her—of the antique Egyptian type. Nobody is ugly but the children, who, however, develop into beautiful youths and maidens. It is even a mistake to call the people dirty: for in the first place the climate will not allow of clammy, sticky, or putrescent dirt;



everything dries up immediately: she has even known meat keep sweet fourteen days. Nor do the people beg out of the line corrupted by European travellers; nor is their poverty degraded. The climate allows an absence of what we consider necessities to an extent irreconcilable to any but an eye-witness, and wherever she goes—

‘There are plenty of gentlemen, bare-footed and clad in a shirt and cloak, ready to pay attentions which you may return with a civil look and greeting, and if you offer a cup of coffee and a seat on the floor, you give great pleasure. Still more if you eat the durah and dates, or bread and sour milk, with an appetite.’—*Ibid.* p. 52.

Our fair traveller not only tolerated the manners of the country, she liked their ways, and professes herself a convert to fingers in preference to forks; and has no repugnance to a morsel from the common dish out of her host's fingers—Arab fingers, that is, washed fifty times a day. Smoking is a matter of course with her. In return for her general conformity, she seems to have met with a liberalism in religious matters equal to her own; a liberality which allowed her to contribute to the maintenance of mosque worship, and led her to visit a French apostate doctor and his hareem. The Arabs are no doubt much less exclusive and rigid in their creed than the Turks, but also it is extraordinary how a certain class of minds always find other people thinking like themselves. Just as in a philosophical novel all the personages are occupied with the topics that occupy the mind of the writer, so an English liberal, going into the hot-bed of fanaticism, finds liberals, and even veritable Colensos with views about the Pentateuch, wherever he goes. He is always falling in with persons giving up doctrine and zeal, and viewing religion solely on its moral or utilitarian side, and agreeing that creeds do not signify, that it is what men *are*, not what they believe. Lady Duff Gordon is one of this fortunate order. What strikes her most is the tolerant spirit she finds everywhere. She has yet to see the much-talked-of fanaticism. She engages a certain Sheyk Yoosuf, a very amiable, interesting, and pure-minded devotee, as we should think him, to teach her the language, but she can twist him round her thumb at a word; indeed he hardly needs such acts to meet her on common ground.

‘I want to photograph Yoosuf for you: the feelings and prejudices and ideas of a cultivated Arab, as I get at them by little and little, are curious beyond compare. It won't do to generalize from one man, of course, but even one gives some very new ideas. The most striking thing is the sweetness and delicacy of feeling, the horror of hurting any one (this must be individual, of course it is too good to be general). I apologized to him two days ago for inadvertently answering “the Salam aleykum,” which he of course said to Omar on coming in, and which is sacramental

to Muslims. Yoosuf blushed crimson, touched my hand, and kissed his own, and looked quite unhappy.

'Yesterday evening he walked in, and startled me by a "Salám aleykee" addressed to me; he had evidently been thinking it over—whether he ought to say it to me, and came to the conclusion it was not wrong. "Surely it is well for all the creatures of God to speak peace (Salám) to each other," said he. Now no uneducated Muslim would have arrived at such a conclusion. Omar would pray, work, lie, do anything for me,—sacrifice money even; but I doubt whether he could utter "Salám aleykum" to any but a Muslim. I answered as I felt, "Peace, O my brother, and God bless thee!" It was almost as if a Catholic priest felt impelled by charity to offer communion to a heretic.'—*Ibid.* p. 205.

Yet Yoosuf was so strict in his religion that he had never read any but religious books.

'No light amusements were proper for an Alèm of the religion. Europeans of course did not know that, as *our* religion was to enjoy ourselves; but *he* must not make merry with diversions, or music, or droll stories . . . He can repeat the whole Koran without book: it takes twelve hours to do it. He has read the Towsat (the Old Testament) and the Gospels, of course. Every Alèm should read them; the words of Seyyidna Eesa are the true faith, but Christians have altered and corrupted their meaning.'—*Ibid.* p. 206.

What Lady Duff Gordon likes in these religionists is, that nobody tries to look pious. The whole assumption of expression and consciousness, in fact, seems to belong to civilization, of which, in our European sense, they have no more in Egypt now than in the days of the Arabian Nights.

She goes on one occasion to see a 'great Sheykh,' a Simeon Stylites, and finds even him a very jolly fellow. Omar stops the boat as she is journeying towards Thebes, as this worthy had requested a visit.

'I walked off and presently found about thirty people, including all my own men, sitting on the ground round Simeon Stylites, without the column. A hideous old man, like Polyphemus, utterly naked, with the skin of a rhinoceros, all cracked with the weather, sat there, and had sat night and day, summer and winter, motionless for twenty years. He never prays, he never washes, he does not keep Ramadan, and yet he is a saint. Of course I expected a good hearty curse from such a man, but he was delighted with my visit, asked me to sit down, ordered his servant to bring me sugar-cane, asked my name, and tried to repeat it over and over again; he was quite talkative, and full of jokes and compliments, and took no notice of any one else. Omar and my crew smiled and nodded, and all congratulated me heartily. Such a distinction proves my excellence (as the Sheykh knows all people's thoughts). Finally Omar proposed to say the Fat-e-hab, in which all joined except the Sheykh, who looked rather bored by the interruption, and who desired us not to go so soon unless we were in a hurry. A party of Bedawees came up on camels, with presents for the holy man, but he took no notice of them, and went on questioning Omar about me, and answering my questions. What struck me was the total absence of any sanctimonious air about the old fellow; he was quite worldly and jocose. I suppose he knew that his position was secure, and thought his dirt and nakedness was sufficient proof of his holiness.'—*Ibid.* p. 66.

All thoughts of conversion on either hand are set down as worse than useless alike by the lady and her Muslim friends; and indeed her various acts of conformity would hardly leave room for the wish on their part, besides that Islamism does not recognise persuasion as an instrument for this purpose. If a *soupçon* of intolerance disturbs the general harmony, it comes from the Christians. She is doctoring the sick at Thebes during an epidemic, and one peevish old Copt

'Refused the chicken broth, and told me that we Europeans had our heaven in this world. Omar let out a "kelb" (dog!) but I stopped him, and said, "O, my brother, God has made the Christians of England unlike those of Egypt, and surely will condemn neither of us on that account: may'st thou find a better heaven hereafter than I now enjoy here!" Omar threw his arm round me and said, "O thou good one! surely our Lord will reward thee for acting thus with the meekness of a Muslimeh, and kissing the hand of him who strikes thy face." (See how each religion claims humility as its characteristic!) It does seem strange that the Copts of the lower class will not give us the blessing, or thank God for our health, as the Muslimeen do. Most of my patients are Christians, and some are very nice people indeed.'—*Ibid.* p. 257.

Of the morals of the people, how far religion is a restraining principle, except in the case of Yoosuf, she does not tell us. Some dark hints she gives, but on the whole she is content to speak as she finds; the people were good to her and she is their champion in return. Thus, after describing the labours of the harvest and raising a very pleasant picture—

'The harvest is the most exquisite pastoral you can conceive. The men work seven hours in the day (i.e. eight, with half-hours to rest and eat) and seven more during the night. They go home at sunset to dinner and to sleep a bit, and then work again—"these lazy Arabs!"'—*Ibid.* p. 246.

Then their hospitality is unbounded, and the grace with which they bestow it her constant theme.

'How you would love the Arab women in the country villages! I wandered off the other day alone, while the men were mending the rudder, and fell in with a troop of them carrying jars. Such sweet attractive beings, all smiles and grace. One beautiful woman pointed to the village, and made signs of eating, and took my hand to lead me. I went with her, admiring my companions as they walked. Omar came running after, and wondered I was not afraid. I laughed, and said they were much too pretty and kind-looking to frighten any one, which amused them exceedingly. They all wanted me to go and eat in their houses, and I had a great mind to it; but the wind was fair and the boat waiting, and I bade my beautiful friends farewell. They asked if we wanted anything, milk or eggs, for they would give it with pleasure; it was not their custom to sell things, they said. I offered a bit of money to a naked child, but his mother would not let him take it. I shall never forget the sweet engaging creatures at that little village, or the dignified politeness of an old weaver, whose loom I walked in to look at, and who also wished "to set a piece of bread before me." It is the true poetical pastoral life of the Bible in the villages where the English have not been, and happily they don't land at the little places. Thebes has become an English watering-place.'—*Ibid.* p. 44.

But we must not continue our extracts. It is a book easily procurable by any reader into whose way it has not yet fallen, and its merits and faults are alike on the surface. Wherever we open a page we are tempted to go on. Without any laboured descriptions, knowing that Egypt in its whole length has been described to satiety, a touch here and there brings the characteristics of the country vividly before us, and there is a freshness, an enjoyment, a kindly feeling, a sustained interest in the land of her temporary adoption, which places these letters far above the ordinary tourist records with which the press has been deluged. But there are serious drawbacks to so much pleasantness. We have *our* ideas of the Englishwoman, as liberalism has of the British female, and we own we should be very sorry to see it modified and 'enlightened' on any large or general scale by the knowledge and tolerance of evil inseparable from a free, unrestricted intercourse with semi-barbarous people, whose religion, whose customs, and whose ideas of morality are in such direct antagonism with all she has been taught and trained to at home. In losing

' Fear and niceness, the handmaids of all women,  
Nay, woman her pretty self ;'

she loses more than mere grace and 'prettiness.' These restraints are weapons in her hands supplying her with tests and rules for a right judgment; they are the instincts which direct her to true conclusions and to her own place under new circumstances; and if they prejudice her on the side of habit, association, and experience, what is this but constituting her the conservative element in human affairs? a place of which surely no one will wish to deprive her who has any respect for things established or any reverence for the old landmarks.

---

ART. V.—*Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtliche Entwicklung dargestellt.* VON DR. EDUARD ZELLER. Dritter Theil. Tübingen: 1865.

THIS is the third part and the fourth volume of a *magnum opus* on the history of Greek philosophy. We fear it would be almost impossible to give our readers any adequate conception of the learning and toil which have been expended upon it, and yet this is the least part of its merits. Singularly unlike most German works which treat of philosophical subjects, this book is written in a clear, masterly style. The grasp of the subject is admirable. The critical judgment displayed is of rare power and discrimination. In a word, we do not see how it would be possible to write a more complete work on this subject, or one which would answer more fully the requirements of the student and the general reader.

We purpose to take advantage of this volume of Dr. Zeller's work, to touch upon two subjects which, if rightly studied, cannot fail to possess great attractions—the religion and the philosophy of Greece.

It has often seemed to us that one great argument in favour of the study of the classics has been almost overlooked. In Greek literature we have, from its earliest development to its overthrow, the history of the religious faith of the most polished and enlightened nation of antiquity. To the earnest Christian student it cannot fail to be a study of the deepest interest to witness in so striking an example the utter powerlessness of fallen man, even at his very best, to rise above the level of his own corrupt nature, when unassisted by Divine revelation. Nothing can be more humiliating to the pride of man than to read how intellects, as lofty and powerful as any that have been bestowed on the sons of men, have terribly erred and come short of the glory of God. Nothing can be more melancholy than the sight of a nation whose art, and literature, and political and intellectual greatness have been the envy and the admiration of posterity, but on whom those splendid gifts might almost seem to have been wasted, a nation whose loftiest thoughts were but of the earth earthy, a people living without God in the world.

For this reason, as well as for many others, we think that the study of comparative theology, if we may venture on the phrase, is of inestimable value. But of all heathen theologies, the theology of Greece is especially interesting. It is the theology of the most remarkable heathen nation; we have the comments

of some of the greatest Greek writers upon it; we can trace it in its political, its social, its moral effects; we see it from its dawn to its wane, from its purity in the time of Homer and Hesoid to its utter corruption and degradation at the close of Greek independence. And no thoughtful man can rise from the study of it without having learnt many great and important lessons.

The Greek religion, moreover, has further claims upon our consideration. It undoubtedly went far to form the character of the Greek nation. The Greek mind and the Greek theology naturally reacted on each other, and very much that is best in both owes its source to this mutual influence. It is not difficult to trace the causes which produced so remarkable a contrast between the religion of the Greeks and the religions of the surrounding nations. All natural religion may be said to spring from two sources—the worship of nature, and the worship of man. Of these two sources the worship of nature is the most important. There is probably no mythology into which it does not enter, and in some it would seem to be the predominant element, to the exclusion of all others. And when we think of it there is nothing strange in such a fact. In the early ages of the human race, when the human intellect is yet in its infancy, before the brute passions have been tamed down by the more spiritual influences of civilization and social union, men look around them for some object of worship, and are naturally attracted to that which affects their senses most. In a land of huge mountains such as Scotland, they are led to enthrone their deity on the peaks of those eternal hills which have seen generation after generation spring up and pass away, and have remained unchanged as of yore. In lands overgrown with vast forests where the axe has never been heard, where man has associated his loftiest ideas of majesty and strength with those gloomy, silent vistas of oak and pine that stretch on every side of him, the Druid and the Teuton unconsciously enshrines his god in the gigantic trees that are ever present to his awed imagination. In the lands of storms and winter, the lands where war and piracy continually expose the restless Norseman to the fury of the elements, the god of the seasons and tempests is worshipped. In the land of the East, where the earth pours forth its gifts without man's toil, where the teeming fertility of nature renders the exertions of the labourer almost needless, the gods and goddesses of produce and generation alone can claim the adoration of an united people; and in the lands where the sun from day to day fills heaven and earth with his unclouded blaze, the Persian involuntarily sinks down on the



mountain top with awe and rapture to hail as his divinity the god of light and life.

But though it seems to us easy enough to grasp these ideas, yet for a barbarous nation it was by no means so easy; and then followed the natural result; man was unable to rise to the level of a great conception, and consequently he dragged the great conception down to his own level. Then came that terrible issue so fearfully described by the great apostle of the Gentiles, when the higher ideal was deserted for the lower, when all religion was leavened with the grossest and most revolting associations. What the fruit of those things was may be learned by any one who chooses to examine into the religions of the Druids and the Brahmins, of Egypt, and Carthage, and Scythia.

From very much of this evil Greece was preserved, and we think that its deliverance was owing in great part to the second source from which its religion was developed. Side by side with the worship of nature, sprang up the worship of man. Though we find marked traces of the nature-worship in the mythology of Homer, it is evident that the worship of man has to a great extent displaced it. Zeus is no longer the fruitful Heaven that descends in showers to impregnate the earth; he is the immortal man who holds the scales of life and death, the awarder of joys and woes to mortals, the great head of the Olympian polity. So, too, Juno is no longer the fertile earth from whose lap springs the rich vegetation of nature, but the great woman-goddess—who bestows *εἶδος* and *πύρρι* on mortals, the impersonation of Greek patriotism, who wearies out her immortal coursers in collecting the nations for the destruction of Troy. Here, in like manner, we find the first traces of the deities connected with man-worship alone, Apollo and Minerva, Ate and the Litai, Mars the god of war, and Vulcan the god of the artisan.

How far the religion of the Greeks rose above the low level of the other heathen religions cannot possibly escape the notice of the classical student. This superiority was in part the result of its imaginative and idealizing tendency. Indeed, this idealizing tendency worked upon the mind of the Greek as the idealizing of love worked upon the passions of the Middle Ages. It purified, it ennobled religion. It divested the religion of Greece of all the terrible and revolting images which are so rife in the other religions of paganism. The whole mythology of Greece is overspread with the rich colouring of a vivid imagination. On every mountain-top an Oread sang, a laughing Dryad peeped out of every tree, a water-nymph sported in the white foam of every streamlet. Under the bright moonlight Diana with her nymphs swept through the darksome groves in

the storm of chase; and in the mid-day heat, as the traveller lay down to repose, he heard the soft tones of Pan's flute far away in the cool valleys.

Nor should we omit to notice, as closely connected with this poetic element, the joyous character of the Greek religion—

‘There should not be a shadow of gloom  
In aught that reminds us of thee’—

was the idea that possessed itself firmly of the religious mind of the Greek. His devotion was to be joyous. Sadness and sternness were to be banished from the presence of the god, for he was the god of gladness, and every heart was to throb with gladness in his presence. The deity felt shame at no joy where the blushing *Camera* and the tender *Graces* overruled the feast. Hence we find that all the ceremonies of their divinities were times of rejoicing for the Greeks. The wine flowed freely, the rose-garlands were twined in their perfumed locks, the dancers circled round the altars, and the hilarity of the devotees pealed forth in song. And all through the choruses of Greek tragedy we can trace the same sentiment: ‘Ho, *Parian*, *Parian*, ‘blessed for ever may’st thou be, son of *Latona*! O *Pan*, *Pan*, ‘that hast roamed over many waters, appear above the rocky ‘peak of *Cyllene*, king of the dance!’ In every burst of rejoicing some one of the gods is invoked to share in their exultation. By this we may understand the triumphal procession of *Bacchus*, the bearer of the *thyrsus* and the yoke of tigers ushering in the bringer of joy, with the *Fauns* and *Satyrs* swarming round, and the frantic *Mænads* weaving dances in his honour. Nay, the grave *Dorian* himself unbent to join in the glorious festival of *Apollo*, when he returned with dance and song from his victory over *Typhon*. Even death was robbed of half its terrors in the eyes of the Greek by this joyous element in his religion. For in the realm of the shades he hoped to attain the blessed fields of *Elysium*, to wander through the dusky groves with the maid he loved on earth, and dance to the melodious notes of *Orpheus*’ lyre.

But the most striking characteristic of the Greek religion was its humanizing tendency. There is scarce any point in which the Greek mythology contrasts so favourably with the other great mythologies of antiquity. A total absence of all wanton cruelty, of all vicious delight in pain and misery, of all inhuman thirsting for blood, impresses us more forcibly than any of its other features. The *Moloch* of the *Syrians*—

‘Besmeared with blood  
Of human sacrifice and parents’ tears,’

the hecatombs of the *Druids*, the hideous immolations of the

Juggernaut, were unknown in the Greek religion. The Eumenides, who alone of the Greek deities inspire us with a feeling of dread, were regarded with equal dread by the Greeks themselves. And it is noticeable that in the play of Æschylus called by their name he is careful to insist on the justice of their hunt after Orestes, never allowing his hearers for a moment to suppose that it is the mere bloodthirsty delight in suffering which urges them in pursuit of the unhappy prince, but their zeal in avenging the most fearful crime that the Greek mind could conceive. So, too, in the *Œdipus* of Sophocles they are associated with no feelings but those of religious awe. They grant a harbourage to the pitiable suppliant, and eventually a quiet departure to the shades below. And perhaps it is attributable to this humanizing tendency of the Greek mythology, this anxiety to keep in the background those terrible ideas which often are knit up so closely with religion, that the *σεμενα θεα* received no offerings of blood, but only milk, and honey, and wine. No doubt this same feeling saved the Greeks from that degraded sense of religion when men, deserting their higher standard, descend to the worship of the brute creation. Nowhere in Greek mythology do we find a trace of the influence of those deities who—

‘With monstrous shapes and sorceries abused  
Fanatic Egypt and her priests, to seek  
Their wandering gods disguised in brutish forms  
Rather than human.’

But pure and bright as the Greek religion will seem when contrasted with the religions around it, it is almost needless to point out the immeasurable distance that severs it from Christianity. The Greek never attained to any higher conception of the greatness and majesty of God than his immortal man, the Apollo and the Jupiter of his mythology. To conceive of a deity like the God of the Jew and the Christian,

‘Him first, Him last, Him midst and without end,’

was altogether beyond his power. And as he had no high idea of the majesty of God, so neither had he any high idea of his absolute holiness and purity. Evil, indeed, he shunned and hated, but far less from a feeling of its absolute antagonism to God and God’s goodness, than from a feeling that it marred the τὸ καλόν, his loftiest standard.<sup>1</sup> Thus in the Greek the

<sup>1</sup> See Aristotle’s *Ethics*, B. iii. 7. 2 : φοβήσεται μὲν οὖν τὰ τοιαῦτα τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα. B. iii. 8. 3 : δι’ ἀρετὴν γίγνεται δι’ αἰδῶ γὰρ καὶ διὰ καλοῦ δρεῖν. So the temperate will desire nothing παρὰ τὸ καλόν. This was also the opinion of Solon as quoted by Aristotle : Σόλων τοὺς εὐδαίμονας ἀπεφάνετο πεπραγότας τὰ κάλλισθ’, ὥς φησι. It is only the lofty and idealistic Plato who says : δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐπιτηδεύομεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς φίλοι ὦμεν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς.

love of the beautiful overpowered the love of the holy, consequently his religion became, above all, sensuous. The most poetic expression of this sentiment is to be found in Homer's beautiful hymn to Earth. Through Earth's agency it is that the fruits hang large and ripe on every tree. For those who pay their worship to Earth's great divinity the life-sustaining soil endures its load of harvest, their cattle yield large increase, and their dwellings are stored with wealth. Their sons exult in the gladness of youth, and their bright daughters leap joyously on the soft flowers amidst the meadow grass. So also we find Ceres crowned with the first-fruits of the corn-fields, and Virgil invoking Bacchus to strip off his buskins and tread out the purple grapes. Love and wine, the dance and the song, bright garlands and the earth's best produce were always united with the worship of the gods. And the same idea may be traced in the outward forms which they attributed to their deities. Apollo was the god of eternal youth, Venus was the ideal of beauty, Hercules the ideal of physical strength. Juno's large eyes and Neptune's broad chest meet us in every book of Homer. No divinity could lay claim to be such were it not for some physical attributes which exalted him above weak man.

Our remarks on this subject have extended, we fear, beyond just limits, but we shall not regret their length if we have succeeded in interesting our readers in a feature of antiquity which is so striking, and upon which writers have dwelt so little.

It was the slow death of the Greek religion that brought to birth the Greek philosophy. The latter asserted over the minds of men the empire which the former had lost. To us the study of the Greek philosophy is more interesting than the study of the Greek religion. For while the influence of the Greek religion has passed away for ever, the influence of the Greek philosophy has been working upon modern philosophy down to the present day. It is a remarkable fact that the Greek systems have almost, without an exception, had their parallels in the systems of modern times. The sensualism of the Stoics and Epicureans was reproduced in the empirical schools of England and France. The neo-academician scepticism lived again in Hume. The Eleatic pantheism may be traced in the tenets of Spinoza. The neo-platonic spiritualism will bear comparison with the idealism of Leibnitz. Nay, even in the ethics of the Christian era there are few views which we cannot illustrate from the philosophers of Greece.

Yet it is not difficult to trace a great difference between the philosophy of the Greeks and of the Christians in the Middle Ages. The philosophy of the latter was controlled by two great

influences, the influence of theology and the influence of the old philosophers. This alone would have sufficed to mark out sharply the boundary line between the two. But, in truth, this distinction was not needed. The genius of the Greek was one, and the genius of the Christian another. The Greek sought his god in nature: the Christian saw nature sink into nothing before his eyes as he thought on his almighty, omnipresent Creator, by whom and in whom all created things lived and moved and had their being. To him it seemed impiety to look for his Maker in nature, if for no other reason, because that nature was stamped with the indelible impress which his sin had left upon it. The Greek confiding to the power of his reason sought to explain the laws of nature: the Christian turned away from the misguiding intellect, whose light sin had darkened, to a revelation whose hidden mysteries he revered the more for their seeming contradiction to the order of things. While the Greek strove to attain to that harmonious union of spirit and body which is the peculiar feature of Greek morality, the Christian aimed at the absolute subjection of the lower nature to the higher, of the impulses of the flesh to the dictates of the spirit. Instead of the Zeus who gave himself up to all earthly and sensual enjoyments, the Christian worshipped a God who had taken man's nature upon Him to mortify the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof. Hence it is not difficult to see how completely opposite were the paths of the philosophy of Greece and the philosophy of the Middle Ages. The former clung to the earth while the latter soared into heaven; the ruling idea with the Greek was the State, with the Christian, the Church; the highest standard of the Greek was to foster the virtue which guided and directed and led to their full development the natural passions, the highest standard of the Christian was to follow in the steps of Him 'Who in all points was tempted like as we are, yet without sin,' to crush remorselessly the lingering affections that bound him to earth if they were inconsistent with his duty to the Saviour who redeemed him.

Though the contrast between the Greek philosophy and the later philosophy of Christendom is less striking, yet even here it is impossible to mistake the distinctive features of both. The Greek philosophy sprang from the Greek religion and the Greek national life, and partakes of the characteristics of both. The most striking of those characteristics was the inseparable union of the spiritual and the corporeal, which formed his highest ideal. Nothing could be less consonant with the Greek mind than the slavery to material desires and material ideas, which appears so revolting in the nations of the East. The spirit is always reckoned as the higher of the two, the man looks on his free

moral agency as the real end of his being; mere sensual enjoyment does not satisfy him, his happiness is the happiness which is bestowed by the *mens sana in corpore sano*, by the perfect harmony of a joyous mind with strong passions, by his active life, by his labour for the common weal of the state, which gave birth to the proud consciousness of his superiority to the barbarians around him. This is the real beauty of the Greek life as compared with that of the other nations of antiquity, this idealizing of the mere animal nature which purified and ennobled him as it purified and ennobled his religion.

But yet the Greek failed altogether in his philosophy as in his religion to draw that sharp distinction between the body and the spirit which meets us everywhere in the philosophy of the Middle Ages as well as in that of later times. The Greek raised himself above nature and blind dependence on the powers of nature, but for all that he did not esteem nature as impure and unheavenly. Nay, he even revered it as a revelation of higher powers which overawed his mind. But this awe implied no slavish or debasing feelings. He could appreciate the proud boast of the Latin poet:—

‘Quem neque fana deum, nec fulmina, nec minitanti  
Murmure compressit cœlum, sed eo magis acrem  
Irritat animi virtutem, effringere ut arta  
Naturæ primus portarum claustra cupiret.  
Ergo vivida vis animi pervicit, et extra  
Processit longè flamman tia mœnia mundi,  
Atque omne immensum peragravit mente animoque,  
Quare religio pedibus subjecta.’

This it was, as Zeller remarks with admirable force, which imparted so peculiar a character to his religion. His gods were really powers of nature, not mere moral abstractions. Their might was not absolute but limited. They had before them eternal Chaos, and above them inexorable Fate. To endow them with his nature and array them in his form was not in the opinion of the Greek any desecration of their godhead. Nay, he thought that he could not honour them more highly than by bestowing on them in larger measure the natural gifts which he enjoyed himself, unearthly beauty and immortal youth, bright palaces on the peaks of Olympus, and nectar such as could be pressed from no grape of earth. So, too, from the Greek point of view, man's nature was not looked upon as corrupt and sinful from his birth. He felt no want of the second birth to holiness. He never demanded the denial of natural inclinations, the crushing of the senses. He was unconscious of that ceaseless strife with the natural man which is almost as marked in the ethics of our philosophy as in the moral teaching of our Bible. And thus Aristotle, in the true spirit of



the Greeks, summed up morality in the law that men should boldly follow their natural impulses and desires, subject to the guidance and direction of right reason.

These principles widely affected the social relations of the Greek to a degree which we can scarcely realize. They narrowed and lowered his views. He found his highest authority in the custom of his state. He found in the state the centre of his highest life. He was totally unable to recognise mankind and his duties and obligations to mankind as a whole. Morality was indissolubly bound up with politics. Women were degraded to the lowest rank. Barbarians were treated with the haughtiest scorn; and slavery was regarded as an indispensable institution of the state.

Socrates was the first great founder of Greek philosophy, and in a certain sense he may be taken as its type. Marsilius Ficinus bestowed on Socrates the title of the John the Baptist of the old world. The comparison is in many points a happy one. To go still further, as some have done, and compare the Greek philosopher to the great Ensamble of perfect love and perfect holiness, the Lamb of God, the Son of Man, seems to us, to say the least, scarcely reverential or Christian. But the mission of Socrates, like the mission of the greatest of Prophets, was to prepare the way, to make straight the paths for Him who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel. Socrates unquestionably gave the first impulse to Greece, and through Greece to the whole Roman Empire. And we feel sure that in the unerring counsels of Him who ordereth all things, the Athenian moralist was destined to sow the seeds of regeneration in those two nations from whom have sprung the art, and literature, and science which do not rank least among the earthly blessings bestowed by our Creator.

Yet, with all this, Socrates was but a heathen, though a great heathen. He was as great as a Greek of the time of the Peloponnesian war could be. His two admiring pupils have left us a picture of him, whose vivid colours time can never dim. 'No one, says Xenophon, 'ever saw or heard Socrates doing or saying aught impious, aught unholy. So pious that no act of his was unaccompanied by the sanction of the gods, so just that he never injured a single man, in the smallest matter, so continent that he never set pleasure above virtue, so wise that he never failed to distinguish between good and evil.' His continence, his self-command, his piety, his patriotism, the strong inward conviction which prompted every word and deed, the thoughtful counsels that were ever ready for his friends, the mingled cheerfulness and earnestness that characterised the loveable companion, are in Xenophon's narrative the chief traits of the

wonderful man who could move even to passionate tears the brilliant, scoffing, immoral Alcibiades. And from this account the picture of his greater disciple differs in no material respects. There, too, we find the simplicity, the penetration, the absolute command over sensual desires, the deep piety, the unflinching obedience to the heavenly voice within, the eager acceptance of death in the consciousness that he had done his duty by God and man.

Still Socrates was eminently a Greek, stamped unmistakably with the impress of his nation and his age, imbued with Greek feelings and Greek thoughts, the teacher of a morality which, though far higher and purer than ordinary Greek morality, was nevertheless peculiarly Greek. Nothing can be more foolish and false than to lavish on him that sickly sentimentality through which some of his modern admirers have sought to elevate his character. It shows as great a want of Christian feeling as of critical judgment, to imagine that Socrates ever attained, or ever could attain to the lofty moral greatness of S. Paul, or S. John. Those who study Xenophon and Plato will arrive at a widely different conclusion. There can be no mistaking the genuine friendliness, the Attic delicacy of perception, the intellectual cheerfulness, the agreeable humour, the convivial spirit which stand in such strong contrast to the more earnest side of his character. He does not shrink from the pleasures of the table. The little cups at Xenophon's feast are to follow quick and close together like drops of rain. His moderation is not an abstinence from enjoyment on principle. He is continent because he thinks it foul shame that the intellectual part of man should become the slave of the senses. How far his views on particular subjects were removed from pure Christian morality may be seen by any one who reads the *Memorabilia*; <sup>1</sup> nay, even though he denounced with the energy of a Christian apostle that terrible form of vice which was the canker-worm of ancient society, there can be little doubt but that his own friendship for Alcibiades was tinged with the hues of the Greek Eros, and leavened with that passion for the beautiful which so powerfully affected the Greek mind.

The real insufficiency of the morality of Socrates when tried by our modern notions will appear more clearly from the standard which he adopted. His great starting point was that all virtue is knowledge. He had convinced himself that there was some radical defect in the moral ideas of his contemporaries. Their virtue was oftener false than real. They were content with the superficial definitions that prevailed in ordinary life, without taking the trouble to test their correctness, or to pierce

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the *Memorabilia*, i. 3, 14; ii. 1, 5; iii. 11; iv. 5, 9.

below the surface to discover the truths that lay hid beneath. What, then, was the one thing wanting? Plainly knowledge. If men really knew that the actions which passed among them for just were really coloured with injustice; if they knew that continence was more truly for their self-interest than incontinence; could it be doubted that a clearer, more solid knowledge would obviate all immorality? It was plain that man would pursue what was best for him; knowledge could not fail to convince passion and silence lust. No man could be vicious of set purpose if he knew that vice was evil. Who, for instance, was the most truly brave man? Clearly the man who knew best the reality of danger and the means for meeting it. Scythians and Thracians would be as little fain to take shield and spear and fight the Lacedæmonians, as the Lacedæmonian would be to meet the Scythian with bow and arrow. That man was pious who knew what was due to the gods; that man was just who knew what was due to his fellow-men. Hence all virtue is resolvable into one type, knowledge.

The question next arises, what is the object of this knowledge? Socrates answers generally, the Good: men are virtuous, just, brave, who know what is good. But how are we to define the good? Here the system of Socrates breaks down. The writings of Xenophon point incontestably to the conclusion that he referred all moral acts to two standards only. The first of these was the established morality of the age. Justice he declared to be the acting in accordance with the laws. When asked how the favour of Heaven may be won, he falls back upon the answer of the Delphic oracle, which bade men observe the traditional worship of the state. In the *Crito*, which of all the Platonic dialogues bears the strongest marks of the Socratic teaching, the noble words which Plato puts into his mouth prove this even more plainly. He must obey the laws of Athens, for he has acknowledged their supremacy by living under them thus long, and to defy them now were to violate the highest principles of justice. 'Obey us, Socrates,' he feigns them to say, 'who have nurtured you, nor set a higher price on children, or life, or aught else than on justice; that so when thou hast reached Hades, thou mayst have wherewith to answer for thy whole conduct to those that bear sway there. But now if thou departest this life, thou departest through the injustice of men, and not through ours: while if thou takest flight, thus basely repaying us with injustice and villainy, trampling on thy compacts and agreements with us, and wrongfully entreating those who merit it least, thyself, and thy friends, and thy country, and us, we will be a thorn in thy side while thou livest, and our brethren below, the laws in Hades, will not

'receive thee friendly, knowing that thou hast striven to work 'our destruction as far as in thee lay;' and Socrates adds, 'the 'sound of these words is ever ringing in my ears, and shuts 'out all others. Let us act as we are doing, Crito, since the god 'thus directs.'

But at times he abandons the common view, and then he is unable to do more than identify the idea with the end. Good is not absolute but relative: good and evil must be measured by their advantages and disadvantages. He tells Aristippus that good is only good inasmuch as it is adapted for a definite end: good may even in certain cases be evil. On this conception of the utility of good he grounds his assertion that no one would prefer vice to virtue. Temperance must be set above intemperance, for it sweetens life. Asceticism is good, for it hardens the body and enables a man to bear himself manfully in the fight, to serve his country and his friends, and to win glory and honour. Vainglory was to be shunned on the principle of *Æsop's* fable, for it unfailingly brought with it disgrace and ridicule. True friends were to be prized as the highest earthly good, as standing a man in stead of hands, and eyes, and ears, and feet. Virtue must be courted with all our power, for she is the best helpmate in peace, and the stoutest ally in war, and the noblest associate for our friends. Her adherents are dear to the gods, and beloved by men, and honoured by their country. The lofty idea of Christian morality, that the chief end of a good action often consists in the mere doing of it, was unknown to the heathen moralist.

The deficiency of the morality of Socrates is further exemplified by his views of marriage. No doubt much that is really great in Greek history sprang from the exaggerated feeling of friendship which is so peculiar to the Greek nation. It was the natural result of a teaching which elevated men, in the words of *Heraclitus*, to mortal gods, and ranked devotion to the state above every other earthly duty. It was part of the same feeling which dictated the proud words of the Spartan heroes, 'Stranger, 'bear tidings to the Lacedæmonians that here we lie in obedience 'to their mandates.' Even Christians cannot fail to admire that noble self-devotion which bound faithful hearts together till death, and which has found so worthy an expression in modern times in *Schiller's* charming ballad. Unhappily it is impossible to deny that this good was very far from being an unmixed good, nay, that in the later days of the heathen world it became a fearful evil. Those vices, which in the words of *S. Paul* ought not to be so much as named amongst Christians, were its immediate fruits. Yet its indirect effects were not its least evil. It

degraded one half of the human race to the level of ignorant slaves. It led men who sought the society of the other sex to the houses of an Aspasia, a Lais, and a Theodite. How thoroughly Greek the mind of Socrates was, is proved by his view of the respective claims of marriage and friendship. Though (as we have said) he reprobates in the most energetic words any friendship save that which is founded upon purity, he does not hesitate to exalt friendship in hyperbolical terms. But of marriage he speaks in terms which would become the lips of Cæsar better than those of Socrates. It is more useful, indeed, to have a good wife than a bad one, for she will perform her duties with greater assiduity. When we seek for higher grounds we find none. He lays down explicitly that a man selects his wife merely for the purpose of rearing up a noble progeny, and implies that he is right in thus selecting her. It was the corner-stone of the teaching of Socrates, as of all Greek morality, to set the claims of the state far above the claims of the family, and love for a fellow-citizen far above love for a wife.

With these views on friendship and marriage we may compare the views of Socrates on the morality of the individual. Here Socrates thought and spoke as only a Greek could have thought and spoken. The germ and goal of Greek morality was not purity, but wisdom. No one who has read the Republic can ever forget that fine myth, adorned with all the splendour of Plato's magnificent diction, about the dark cave, and the chained captives, and the fire ever burning behind them, and the dim, transitory shadows ever flitting before them. This myth Socrates applies by informing his hearers that mankind are those unhappy captives, and that man's highest aim should be to emerge from that dark cave of unrealities to the bright world of intellectual wisdom, and turn the eye of the soul upon the idea of Good. In like manner Aristotle sets the life of philosophical contemplation above every other. With what virtues (he asks) are we to suppose the gods endowed? Can we suppose that they find occasion for the exercise of justice, or courage, or liberality, or temperance? and if not, unless they dream away existence like Endymion, what life is left them save the life of contemplation? 'Hence, since intellect is the divinest part of man, we must strive as far as in us lies to win immortality, and do all we can that we may live in accordance with the noblest part within us.' Socrates would have been less than a Greek had he shaken himself free of this prejudice which runs through the whole of the moral philosophy of Greece. He calls temperance the corner-stone of all the virtues, but the reason which he gives for the designation is most significant. "Who without this would learn aught good, or care for it worthily? or who

'would not, in slavery to pleasures, fare ignobly in body and soul? To me it seems that a free man should pray never to become such a slave, but that if he be a slave to such pleasures he should beseech the gods to grant him kindly masters. You, Antiphon (he said on another occasion), seem to think that luxury and wealth constitute happiness. But I am of opinion that to lack nothing is the lot of a god, and to lack the fewest things possible the nearest approach to that lot.' His great aim was to free the intellect from the dimming influence of unbridled passion, which enervate mind and body alike, and unfit man for the pursuit of wisdom. The leading idea of his morality, as Zeller has well said, was less the moral purity than the intellectual freedom of man.

But after making every deduction, the immense influence of Socrates for good can scarcely be exaggerated. Nothing proves his moral greatness more incontestably than the fact that his character has not been lowered by the incomparable satire of the Athenian comedian. Few were the men who could have faced with impunity that terrible ordeal. It has left its mark on the dicasts and the ecclesiæ of Athens, on Nicias, on Demosthenes, on Cleon, on the sonorous poesy of Æschylus, on the tender tragedies of Euripides. But posterity has fully acquitted Socrates of the charges which Aristophanes brought against him. Little did Aristophanes guess how much he had in common with the strange man who wandered about the streets and cross-questioned in the market-place,—who, with a truer courage than himself, dared to stay the raging populace from committing a great political crime,—who, with a truer wisdom, strove not to bring back the bygone times of the heroes of Marathon (for that he knew to be impossible), but to replace their simple manly virtues by a morality founded on a nobler principle and tried by a severer test, and verily he has had his reward. Wherever the immortal literature of Greece is read, the name of Socrates has become a household word. Even now, through the dim shadows of twenty-two centuries, we can gaze in imagination on that bright sunset which closed over the city of the violet crown. Even now we can see in our mind's eye the sun's last rays tinging with a richer hue the waves of the Bay of Salamis, and streaming in upon that mournful band of disciples clustered around their dying master, and hanging upon the last words which fell from his lips. Even now we can feel some of the keen regret and tender love which filled the heart of his friends as they watched that noble spirit parting from them, as they closed the eyes and composed the limbs of him who had lived so purely in a corrupt generation, who had striven so bravely to combat the immoral tendencies of a sophistical morality, who had suffered neither the coldness and desertion of pupils, nor



the mockery of the careless multitude, nor the fierce opposition of angry foes, to turn him from the path of duty.

The teaching of Socrates formed in part the basis of the teaching of his famous disciple. But the genius of Plato was too soaring to allow him to halt at the negative method of his master, and thus his writings introduce a new era into the history of Greek ethical philosophy.

The ethical doctrines of Plato were chiefly directed against the morality which had been taught by the Sophists. That morality in his opinion had been built on the most worthless of all foundations, the common verdict of mankind. The Sophists merely acted the part of keepers to a huge monster, who soothe his anger, minister to his pleasures, study his whims and caprices, interpret his signs of gratification and displeasure, and dignify their knowledge with the name of wisdom. These so-called Sophists were not the true perverters of noble souls. All such perversion he laid at the door of the real teachers of immorality, the ignorant mob, who whenever assembled gave forth their expressions of approbation and disapprobation as the fancy seized them, and swept down the torrent all who came within reach of their influence. Thus the ethics of Plato commenced with the demolition of the current opinions about virtue.

His objections to the virtue springing from these current opinions are clearly stated. In the first place, it was a virtue founded on floating conceptions. What seemed virtue to-day, to-morrow might seem vice. No knowledge was needed to attain it: no teacher could be found to inculcate it. This virtue contained no pledge of its duration. It might be raised by a breath and laid by a breath, the prey of chance and the accidental circumstances of birth and fortune which surrounded its possessor. If under such conditions men were to be found of sterling integrity, it could be attributed to nothing but some god-sent fortune, some enthusiasm which made them shun vice with all the disgust of a noble nature. This train of thought led Plato back to the teaching of Socrates, that knowledge is the essential element of a virtuous character. Let men once know what they mean by virtue, justice, temperance, courage, and reality will be given to the shifting shadows, evil will be no longer mistaken for good and good for evil; but inasmuch as it is a palpable absurdity to conceive that a man would deliberately prefer a poison to a medicine, so too it is ridiculous to suppose that if he knows the distinction between virtue and vice, he can hesitate for one moment to choose the former before the latter; and carrying out this argument with his usual hardihood, he boldly asserted that it were better to sin wilfully than unwittingly.

But if the common virtue was defective in itself, it was not less so in consideration of the motives which stimulate men to the pursuit of it. Honour, wealth, a fair reputation, health, quiet, such were the mainsprings of human action. Against this principle Plato protested vehemently. It is easy enough, he argued, for Miltiades to play the man at Marathon with the eyes of all Greece upon him, and immortality on the Propylæa luring him onwards. It is easy enough for Aristides to deal uprightly by his neighbour, knowing that he shall receive the title of the Just. But such is not the principle on which virtue should be pursued. Apart from all advantages, the virtuous will still cling to his virtue, even though it be linked indissolubly with ignominy and pain. 'We have not,' says Socrates in the tenth book of the Republic, 'introduced the rewards and honours which follow in the wake of virtue, as you said that Homer and Hesiod do, but have asserted that simple justice is best for the soul, and that it is the soul's imperative duty to practise justice, whether or not it have the ring of Gyges and the helmet of Pluto as well.'

Thus much for the destructive side of Plato's ethics. When we turn to the constructive side as he has set it before us in the Republic, we find that he proposes the Good as the highest object to which man can attain. As the sun in the visible world is the source of light and vision, the Good in the intellectual world is the origin of knowledge and of truth; and as he who in the visible world turns his eyes from the sun to objects lighted by the moon and stars becomes dim-sighted and blind, so in the intellectual world the soul which turns from the Idea of Good to the shifting realm of opinion, loses the faculty of reason and truth. Here we meet with a difficulty which Zeller treats with his usual acuteness. For, from the Philebus, where the question—What is the Good? forms the subject of discussion, it would seem that Plato identified the Good with the goal of man's existence, since the Good is declared to be a life which unites pleasure and wisdom. To this Socrates refers in the Republic, when he says that some hold pleasure and others wisdom to be the Good. But if the Idea of the Good is the origin of truth and knowledge, imparting to men the power to discern them, and endowing them with their very existence, it is plain that we must understand it to be not an end only, but a creative power, nay more, the sole creative power, and thus no place will be left for the God of Plato's system. Did Plato mean then to indentify God with the Good? It is scarcely possible to suppose that he did not. As Zeller remarks most justly, we shall find more than one difficulty if we place a God by the side of the world of Ideas. It would deprive them of their

eternal and independent nature. The Idea of the Good could not rank above all else, for it would be inferior to the deity from whom it was derived. On the other hand, how could God be an offspring of the Ideas? How, if He were so, could He be eternal and absolute? How would He differ from the spirits of the stars and the souls of men? Or can we suppose that he intended these two powers to stand side by side, God's activity consisting in the union of the Ideas with material objects, in fashioning the world after their pattern? It is scarcely credible that Plato would have assigned to his highest principle so dualistic a character. On this supposition would not the same hold good of God as of all else without the world of Ideas that he is what he is by virtue of his participation in the Idea? Thus it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Plato really did mean to identify God and the Good, and this is in harmony with what is recorded of his later teaching, in which he designated the most complete unity as the Good. However difficult it may be for us to realize this double nature as the Good and the creative power, it is necessary to bear in mind the distinction for the right understanding of Plato's meaning.

If we ask what we are to understand by the Good, interpreting it in the sense of the end of man, we shall find that Plato regarded it from a twofold point of view, a negative and a positive. In accordance with his idealistic teaching, which exalted the Idea above all else, and regarded matter as a transitory, imperfect, and perishable imitation of the Idea, he has summed up the most perfect morality in the flight from the earthly to the divine. Under this form his teaching appears in the *Theatetus*, where, in noble words, he bids man strive, since evil must ever be blended with good and haunt our mortal nature and the earth on which we dwell, to take wings and flee to God by likening ourselves to His nature as far as in us lies. And in the *Phædo* this thought occurs again where the philosopher is marked most strongly by his desire to turn from the body to the soul. For the body is the soul's dungeon and grave. This is the bane which it must shake off before it can reach truth. This is the foul abode into which it was forced against its will; from this the soul has contracted that mortal part which is rife with terrible and inevitable passions—pleasure, the greatest bait of vice, and pain that makes us shun virtue, and rashness and cowardice foolish counsellors. Undoubtedly evil has its seat in the soul, but the soul would be beset with no temptation to follow its dictates were it not for the agency of the body. Hence come the ten thousand torments which daily life forces upon us, the passions, the lusts, the terrors, the manifold phantoms and follies wherewith it fills us. Like the

sea-god Glaucus, whose limbs have been broken and marred by the beating waves, and encrusted with sea-weed and shell-fish till he bears scarce a semblance to his former self, so likewise the soul, by the defilements of the body, has been bereft of its unsullied purity and spoiled of its surpassing beauty. Nor can it hope to regain that purity and beauty till the body has been brought into subjection to the power of reason and truth.

This view of the highest good brought Plato nearer than any Greek philosopher to the asceticism of Christianity; and yet at the same time it shows more clearly than the philosophical tenets of any other Greek philosopher the breadth of the gulf which separates the ethics of Christendom from the ethics of heathendom. For while the former loved the contemplation of the childish innocence and simplicity which pursued good because it knew not evil, the latter always inclined, as has been already remarked, to the intellectual phase of virtue, which found its most complete consummation in the perfect wisdom of a mind trained to the loftiest studies.

But Plato could not stop here if he wished to build up an ethical system in accordance with the spirit of antiquity. Thus arose the need of a positive side in his morality, which attributed an unmistakeable importance to the lower element of our being. In his discussion on love in the *Symposium*, though he proclaims its real object to be the Idea, yet he allows the value of the sensual manifestation as a stepping-stone to the attainment of the immortal and unchangeable. First comes the love for fair forms; then the love for fair souls, which find their expression in the handiwork of art and in moral discourses: thirdly, the love for the beauty which dwells in science; and lastly, the love for that which is alone deserving of love, the Idea of Beauty. Similarly in the *Philebus*, though pleasure is ranked below wisdom, yet a life of apathy and insensibility to pains and pleasures would possess no charms. Nor would the pleasure derived from pure knowledge alone suffice to render life desirable; we must take into account the delight which we receive from opinion, insufficient though it be, and those arts which add to the sum of human enjoyment. And so Plato is led in the true Greek spirit to reckon the eternal nature of the μέτρον first and foremost among the qualities of the highest good, and the realization of this Idea in the world around us, in the καλόν and τέλειον as the second, reason and wisdom as the third, art and science as the fourth, and pure, painless bodily pleasure as the fifth. In Plato's Ethics we discern the same prominent characteristic to which we have already alluded, the endeavour to harmonize the whole nature, to apportion to the sensual and

intellectual parts their right places in unison with the laws of beauty, symmetry, and truth.

The chief means for attaining the highest good, according to Plato's view, was virtue. As each being has its own individual excellence, so too the soul, and without virtue man is miserable, with it he is happy. For virtue consists in the harmony and order of the whole man, nor can its perfection be reached till the concupiscent, the fiery, and the reasoning elements have occupied their fitting place, and no longer interfere each with the work of the other. Hence to ask whether injustice is better than justice is as absurd as to ask whether the plague-stricken man is better off than the healthy man, whether the animal part of our nature should rule the god-like part, or the god-like part keep down the animal part. The virtuous man will be freed from all the fierce and frantic masters that beset the profligate; and though outwardly to the world, the profligate may show the fairest form, revelling in the pleasures of this life, with friends and wealth and power at his command, yet within he is a world of dissension, his soul the battle-ground on which his vices contend for the mastery. But the virtuous, though apparently wanting in those delusive pleasures which are called happiness, has within himself a fount of joy of which the world knows nothing, for he becomes day by day more like the divine type of goodness and holiness which he ever keeps before his eyes; and even if men and gods were totally unable to distinguish the just from the unjust; though in the opinion of all mankind the just were to seem unjust, and the unjust to be gifted with the reputation of justice; still, in spite of all, the just would be truly happy and the unjust truly wretched.

But Plato did not for a moment allow that such an extreme was possible. It was rarely that the world was deceived in this matter, and the gods never. At the outset of his career it was conceivable that the man who shrank from nothing might make his way the best, but in the decline of life his true colours would appear, and even on this earth virtue would receive its reward, and vice its punishment. This, however, was but an insignificant recompense compared with the inestimable felicity reserved for the good in the world to come. There they would enjoy the delights of an earth gleaming with the brightest hues, laden with trees and flowers and fruits as fair, lighted by heavenly luminaries whose splendour no cloud could dim, the dwelling-place and the sanctuary of the gods. Let no man, then, have a fear for his soul who in this life has bidden farewell to the pleasures and adornments of his body, knowing that they will work his ruin, but has arrayed his soul in a glory all its own, in temperance, and justice, and courage, and freedom, and

truth. This confident expectation of the immortality for which he yearned so fondly, has invested the ethics of Plato, beyond any heathen writings, with an interest for Christian readers.

And yet Plato, like his master Socrates, was unable to rise completely above the level of his time and age. This we may see from the scale of virtues where wisdom ranks far above all others, and in a certain sense is the only virtue which deserves the name, since it is the only virtue which springs from true knowledge. Temperance, justice, and courage have a certain merit, but that merit mainly consists in giving full play to the virtue which alone is able to contemplate the absolutely good. His remarks on falsehood bear the same stamp. In his opinion the real liar was not the man who wilfully deceived his fellow-men, but the man who proved basely false to his own soul, and looked on with indifference while it was convicted of the deadliest falsehood, ignorance. This is the gravest deficiency in Plato's system; on this principle it is plain that virtue becomes merely the handmaid of intellect. Though the rewards of justice may be proposed to all, yet it is unmistakeable that in accordance with the glowing description at the close of the seventh book of the Republic, the philosophers are the favoured class for whom are reserved the bright abodes in the realms of the blest, and sacrifices, and monuments, and deification on earth. They are the class of pure gold, the others are alloyed with silver, and copper, and iron. This Greek spirit is still more plainly shown in his remarks on Eros. Indeed it seems scarcely credible that a morality so lofty should admit of immorality so revolting. The exquisite diction and gorgeous imagery of the Phædrus, the mortal and immortal steeds yoked to the car of the soul, breathing from their nostrils an earthly and a heavenly flame, the one content to follow the guidance of the charioteer, the other champing the bit and pawing the ground beneath the goad of desire, cannot shroud the impurity of the thought which pervades the whole. The whole extent of the iniquity of the heathen world is revealed to us when we find their greatest moralist leniently reproving the most monstrous of vices, as vulgarity and want of good taste. And this Greek feeling infected Plato's opinions on marriage. Like the rest of his countrymen, he could not see that marriage answered any higher purpose than the preservation of race. It is true that with a greatness of mind worthy of himself he strove to raise women out of the degraded position to which they were condemned by the Greek world. He was even content to admit them to his sanctum sanctorum, his sacred class of philosophers. But that there should be any pure affection between the sexes based on a community of interests and a mutual regard, which



on the one side might find its expression in the most chivalrous respect, on the other in the most loving reverence, appeared to him not only needless but positively harmful. So little was the most polished writer of the most polished nation of antiquity able to free himself from the shackles of custom and prejudice.

It is impossible to treat fully Plato's ethical system without noticing the defects in it arising from the confusion of ethics and politics. This confusion runs through the teaching of all Greek philosophers, but in none does it appear more markedly than in Plato. The state was merely a magnified man; its virtues were human virtues on a larger scale; its diseases and vices were the counterpart of those which infected the individual. Naturally this hypothesis, which Plato takes for granted throughout, led him to rank the importance of the state above the importance of the individual. Everything must yield to the demands of the community—fatherly love, ease of body, literary tastes, and philosophical studies. In short, the state was to be everything. Its duty was to direct all social arrangements, to prescribe the sphere of poets, musicians, and painters, to assort the marriages, to allot to each class its respective duties, and to care nothing for the happiness of the one if it were inconsistent with the happiness of the many. This polity could only exist if the rulers were faultless, and he did not hesitate to assert that until kings were philosophers and philosophers kings, there could be no cessation of the evils with which the whole of mankind were plagued. We cannot wonder that, entertaining such views, he should have entirely disregarded the lowest class of his community. He never provided for their education, he never allowed them to strive to reach the higher virtues of the guardians or the rulers. Such a system could not fail to necessitate the destruction of all free agency. The great mass of his citizens were drilled into mere machines, engaged in mechanical trades, and condemned to gaze for ever on the fleeting shadows in the dark cave of this earth. This is the grand fault of Plato's system. He provided only for the favoured few, and thrust down the mass of mankind to a position which he himself esteemed worthy only of pity and contempt.

ART. VI.—1. *The Christians of S. Thomas, and their Liturgies ; comprising the Anaphoræ of S. James ; S. Peter ; the Twelve Apostles ; Mar Dionysius ; Mar Xystus ; and Mar Evannis ; together with the Ordo Communis.* Translated from Syriac MSS. obtained in Travancore. By the REV. GEORGE BROADLEY HOWARD, B.A. late Assistant Chaplain in the Diocese of Madras. John Henry and James Parker, Oxford and London.

2. *Æthiopic Liturgies and Prayers.* Translated from MSS. in the Library of the British Museum and of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and from the Edition printed at Rome in 1548. By the Rev. J. M. RODWELL, M.A. Translator of the Koran, the Book of Job, &c. No. I. N.B. No. II. will contain the Baptismal Offices, and Selections from the Degua or Hymnal of Jared. Reprinted from the *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record.* Williams and Norgate. London : 1864.

3. *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, MCCCCII.—MD. e codicibus manuscriptis bibliothecæ palatinæ Vindobonensis : sumptus præbente Cæsareæ Scientiarum Academia.* Ediderunt FR. MIKLOSICH, Prof. Universit. Vindobonensis, et JOS. MÜLLER, Prof. Universit. Patavinæ. Tomus tertius. Vindobonæ Carolus Gerold. 1865.

4. *Ritus Orientalium Coptorum, Syrorum et Armenorum, in administrandis sacramentis. Ex Assemanis, Renaudotio, Trombellio aliisque fontibus authenticis collectos, prolegomenis, notisque criticis et exegeticis instructos, concurrentibus nonnullis theologis ac linguarum orientalium peritis.* Edidit HENRICUS DENZIGER, Phil. et SS. Theol. Doctor et in Universitate Wirceburgensi Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Professor Publ. ord. Wirceburgi: Typis et sumptibus Stabelianis, 1864.

5. *The Divine Liturgies of our Holy Fathers, John the Golden-mouthed (S. Chrysostom), and Basil the Great.* From the Greek and Russian. London : Shepherd. 1865.

WHAT a glorious day that will be for the whole Catholic Church —by whatever branch of that Church it might be undertaken— which should see a Panliturgicon ! We mean a work which should do for Liturgiology what those patient Bollandists have been

doing for these 240 years, and are still doing, for Hagiology—a work which should reprint, or, in many cases, print for the first time, every known liturgy; in its own language first, but also with a Latin translation on the opposite page. There would be of course a commission of some five or seven to direct the whole thing: under them they would have the first and ripest scholars of the time to edit their own liturgy in their own language. Dead liturgies, as well as living; half-dead liturgies also; in the Western Church, the Gallican, and the Ambrosian, and the Mozarabic, and the fragments of the Patriarchine, as well as the Roman; the latter traced down from the Gelasian and Gregorian rites to its present development. In the East, only think of the dead offices! S. Mark, S. James (except on one day in the year, in a few islands of the Archipelago), the Clementine, and the living rites, S. Chrysostom, and S. Basil. Then some first-rate Coptic scholar, like Mr. Rodwell, would take in hand the singular liturgies, half barbarous, half beautiful, in Abyssinia, and would trace them up to those Greek offices, which deriving their source from S. Mark and its daughter-liturgies, that of S. Cyril especially, have held their place, amidst innumerable strange additions, when their fountains have long ceased to yield any other supply. We must have Armenian scholars, too, to edit that liturgy properly, in which, notwithstanding their verbal heresy, so many Saints have for fourteen hundred years celebrated, of which so many Vartabieds have taught; in dependence on which so many faithful souls who have fallen asleep are now awaiting their Resurrection. Then that marvellous Maronite office—the hardest of all offices to understand—who but a Maronite himself can edit for us? And how many Syriac scholars shall we not want to edit the forty—now Jacobite—liturgies? And how many Syrian travellers shall we not also need to rout out of the recesses of their monasteries better MSS. than we have begged, or bought (not to come to the third alternative), to say nothing of fresh treasures in that way to be discovered? And still further, we want other Syriac scholars, who shall take the Nestorian liturgies in hand, the norm of which certainly dates from the time of the Apostles, while the superinduced heresy is as easily brushed off as a cobweb from a window.

And is that all? By no means. Now we come back to the great Eastern Church as it exists at this day: as it gave from the beginning—as it still gives—its liturgies to its children in their vernacular tongue. And first, we shall want some Slavonic scholar to give us a perfect edition of the rite of the Russian Church. Then we shall come down to the far less important ones: the Turkish, the Wallachian, and whatever

other translations may have been made, wherever the Eastern Church has established her throne.<sup>1</sup>

But to descend—always a difficult task—from that which might, and, let us hope may yet, be to that which is. Books like those which stand at the head of this article are so easily passed over by such as are not throwing their whole hearts into liturgiology; and yet to those who are, they are absolutely essential. Sometime ago, we gave a short account of Mr. Howard's (then unpublished) work: we now propose to examine it at greater length. It must, we think, gratify every member of the English Church, that, in spite of the heretical additions—so easily to be separated from the original composition—the book is, by permission, dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Mr. Howard, then an assistant chaplain in the diocese of Madras, found his lot thrown in among the Christians of S. Thomas, as ancient a church as any in the world. True, in the sixth or seventh century, when the Nestorian heresy could count more communicants than the Eastern and Western Churches put together, India did not—as how should it?—escape the contagion. True, that in the reaction from the violent Roman interference, and especially from the synod of Diamper, the Church of Malabar swung right round to the opposite pole of the compass, and, from Nestorian, became Jacobite. But anyhow, their liturgies are Apostolic, and come down to us no farther marred than that any moderately fair liturgical scholar can correct them. And here we think that sufficient praise can hardly be given to Mr. Howard. It would appear that, up to the time of his settlement in Malabar, he had paid no especial attention to liturgical matters. But, entertaining the kindest feeling towards the struggling Christians of S. Thomas, and therefore, of course, most kindly treated by them, he has done what he could to make them better known to us, and has taught liturgical students—what they did not know before—that they also, like their fellow-Christians further west, have more than one liturgy.

Mr. Howard, through the kindness of a catanar, became pos-

---

<sup>1</sup> It is a point of which we should like to know the truth, and of which we should be the last to venture to decide on the propriety, whether that most holy and Apostolic prelate, Innocent, Bishop of the north-east of Kamschatka and of the Aleoutine Islands, finding that his flock had no possible conception of what a lamb was, while a young seal stood in the same place to them that a lamb does to us, thus translated the *Agnus Dei*. This same difficulty has been felt before. In the islands of the Pacific lambs were unknown, but other small quadrupeds were not. The natives might therefore be taught about a creature like the latter, only so infinitely more gentle. There we suppose the wisest way was, as our Missionaries have done, from the Greek *ἀρνίον*, to invent the word (as their converts cannot pronounce two consonants together) *Arenio*. But the intense difficulty of the Jesuit Missionaries in Cochin China, where the word lamb signified what goose or donkey does with us, who can tell?

sessed of two MSS., both of which we have had the privilege of examining. From these he has edited the Anaphoræ of S. James, S. Peter, the Twelve Apostles, Mar Dionysius, Mar Xystus, Mar John, together with the ordinary liturgy. It is very true that Renaudot had translated all these before. But Renaudot's book is not so easily accessible even now, and till its re-publication in 1847 it was scarcely accessible at all. The Anaphora of S. James will be found (we quote Leslie's edition) volume ii. page 29; that of S. Peter, page 145; that of the Apostles (otherwise called from S. Luke), page 170; that of Mar Dionysius, page 448; that of Mar Xystus, page 134; and that of Mar John (Chrysostom), page 255. The six liturgies which Mr. Howard has translated may be very profitably compared with Renaudot's antecedent translation. They are not word for word the same: but in, so to speak, salient expressions the coincidence shows that the Christians of S. Thomas, when they embraced Jacobitism, had very good copies of their new offices. It is well known that two out of the three Nestorian liturgies have no Words of Institution, and that some of the Jacobite liturgies are in the same position. It has always been a disputed point whether this arose from a violent Orientalism, disposed to throw the whole stress of the change on the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, or whether, which has been the general opinion of the highest scholars, the words were, through reverence, omitted, and were designed to be repeated by memory. When we find more and more examples of some copies retaining, others omitting, them in the same liturgy, we arrive at almost a moral certainty that the latter is the true hypothesis. We cannot but remark at how very low an ebb is the study of Liturgiology all over Europe; and here more especially the fault lies on the Eastern Church, as so much more interested in the question, and so much nearer to the place: that no one, both liturgically and philologically capable, should on the spot have put an end to all doubt. It reminds one of that most singular dissertation of Richard of S. Victor, in his noble commentary on the Apocalypse, where, writing on the vengeance threatened against 'that woman Jezebel' (Rev. ii. 20), he discusses the question whether, where we of course read, 'Behold, I will cast her into a bed,' it should not be rather, 'Behold, I will cast her into grief;' the 'lectum' and 'luctum' of the Vulgate being so similar, and both having such good MS. authority. And this, apparently, without the smallest idea that, though probably no man in France was then capable of making it, one single look at the Greek would have disposed of the question for ever. And yet he lived when there were giants in the earth in those days, and he was one of the giants himself. The wonder is, not that he

and his fellows should not have understood Greek—that Greek which they had no chance of learning—but that he should not have at least hinted the possibility of a future solution of a then indissoluble difficulty.

We will now mention one or two remarkable points in the MSS. which Mr. Howard has translated.

In the Anaphora of 'the Twelve Apostles the rubrical mark in the words of the Institution, after the 'brake' and the 'shed,' teaches us what is meant by the six-fold fracture, of which the great Syro-Jacobite doctors speak. It has its origin, manifestly, in the same cause which, it is said, made the feet of mediæval chalices hexagonal—that our Lord suffered at the sixth hour of the sixth day.

At p. 306, we have a note which, had not the translator been, as so many of our clergy are, both here and in the Roman Church, quite at sea about the 'Filioque' controversy, he could not have written. No Oriental Christian, orthodox or not, could possibly object to an expression—which is not at all 'remarkable'—'Be Thou pleased to sanctify these oblations by the descent of 'Thy Holy Ghost, Who proceedeth eternally from Thee, and 'receiveth essentially from Thy Son.' Why, the very difference of expression between 'proceeding eternally' and 'receiving essentially,' ought to have prevented that note. How could any one demur to the orthodoxy of the passage, who, on the one hand, remembered our Lord's saying, 'Even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father;' and on the other, His equal saying, 'He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you'?

We will now come to the Common Order: that Liturgy of S. James from which the others borrow all those parts which are only expressed in the MSS. and in the printed copies by the initial words. It will here be worth while to notice the chief differences of the *Ordo Communis* in Mr. Howard's translation, and in Renaudot.

After the prayer of the commencement follows in the former the Proemium and a Sedra, by no means without their beauty, but of the very latest date, which is not in the latter. The prayers at the lighting the two tapers are much more fully given by Howard; the rubrics about the preparation of the Seal (that is, of course, the Oblation) in Renaudot.

After the blessing of the mixed cup, there is, in Howard, an especial blessing of the water, couched in words which, however perfectly capable of a good sense, are suspicious in a Jacobite liturgy. After that beautiful Sedra of Penitence, the verse is far fuller in Howard's than in Renaudot, and probably merely a development of that which seems to be the earlier form.



The prayers while the priest is vesting himself are, with a few verbal variations, the same in both translations. Those who are not well acquainted with the Syriac liturgies may be interested in knowing that there is a collect to be used while the celebrant is putting off his ordinary dress, and that he wears a manipule on his right arm as well as on his left.

In the Sedra of the Incense (when intercession is made, after the custom of the whole Oriental Church for all saints, S. Mary included), in Howard, the Mother of God is mentioned between monks and cenobites on the one hand, and orphans and widows on the other, instead of heading that glorious list as it is in Renaudot. This must surely be the mistake of a careless copyist. In the lections it is worthy of notice that the Lesson from the Acts of the Apostles, which precedes the Epistle, and appears to answer to the prophecy in many parts of the early Western Church, is omitted in Howard: one among many slight touches which may show that the compiler or transcriber of the MS. though clearly not a Latin, nevertheless had been to a certain extent exposed to Latin influence.

There is a long Sedra, and a magnificent ectene in Howard, which are entirely omitted in Renaudot: the ectene may well take its place amongst the most beautiful of the Eastern Church. We cannot but wonder that in giving the initial letters Σ and Π for the deacon's next exclamation, Mr. Howard should say that they *probably* stood for 'Wisdom: let us attend.' Equally in the Armenian, the Nestorian, the Syro-Jacobite, the Coptic, and the Æthiopic Liturgies, are certain, so to speak, catch-words of that Greek original retained: exactly as the Roman Church has kept untranslated Kyrie Eleison, and in the Reproaches, Kurios o Theos: exactly as the English Church has kept Amen, and—with one unfortunate exception—Alleluia.

It is worth observing how tenderly, in all these Syriac prayers, the dead are spoken of. It is almost always 'our dead:' and before the Anaphora, the priest twice prays for his own father and mother and brothers and sisters. In this there is a singular analogy with the Ephesine family of liturgies: the Petrine has nothing like it; nor has the Alexandrine. But the Mozarabic always speaks so tenderly of the departed; and the Gallican often prays 'for our dear dead.' It would be a curious liturgical inquiry to work out more analogies between the great liturgical families derived from S. John and from S. Thadæus. Would it be a very extravagant supposition if we thought that we might discover in this tenderness, unknown to other families, a little trace of the Apostle of Love?

At the lifting the veil there is a most singular prayer, or Sedra, given by Howard in the Ordo Communis, and clearly referred

to by its initial words in the Liturgy of S. Peter (S. Peter 2). 'Thou art the hard rock which sent forth the twelve rivers of water for the twelve tribes of Israel. Thou art the hard rock which was set against the tomb of our Redeemer.' The writer is not ashamed to confess that these words are utterly incomprehensible to him. The first sentence might indeed well apply to our Lord: the second, by a very forced metaphor, might perhaps be taken of the veil. But to connect both with either our Lord or the veil seems impossible. And then the absence of the words from all Renaudot's liturgies is very remarkable, and yet the Sedra seems old. This is a point which deserves attention.

After the Anaphora there is scarcely the least likeness between Howard and Renaudot, the former being much more lengthy, the latter being as it were a simple skeleton. After the Invocation, the prayer 'for holy Sion, the mother of all Churches,' is especially to be noticed: it must, as we have said before now, date from the time while the Apostles dwelt yet together in Jerusalem. After this, Howard is wonderfully fuller than Renaudot, and fuller in such a way that the former had clearly better MSS. than the latter. There are insertions in Renaudot which the veriest novice would feel at once to be some 500 or 600 years later than Howard: insertions which, however, do not stretch out the more recent office to the length of the former. But we do most earnestly recommend every liturgical scholar to possess himself of, and to study thoroughly, Mr. Howard's book. It is not necessary that he should understand Syriac. But all the more it is necessary that he should acquaint himself with the latest discovery of Syriac manuscripts; and should, as they say, put together this and that. To the great disgrace of the whole Western Church, be it said, that, since the death of one who was as true a servant of God as he was a first-rate liturgical scholar, Renaudot, nothing had been done towards the elucidation of Syriac liturgies. In the same way, nothing had been done towards a fuller knowledge of and sympathy with the Eastern Church in its geographical divisions, since the death of Le Quien left his marvellous work imperfect. 'Other men laboured, and ye have entered into their labours.' True as that saying of Him Who spake as never man spake must be everywhere and always, no one, we should think, could so enter into it as those who give themselves up to the ancient liturgies concerning which—though we need not quite believe that our dear Lord dictated one of them with His own mouth to S. James, as we read in one of the rubrics of that Syro-Jacobite rite—yet this we have not only asserted but (as we hope) have proved over and over again, that the frame-work of

S. James' Liturgy, therefore also of S. Mark's, therefore also of S. Thaddeus', therefore also, most probably, of S. John's, is older than S. Paul's Epistles; and that if he quotes from them in one place, wherever two identical passages occur, he must also quote from them in the other. After the consecration Mr. Howard is most certainly right in understanding that most strange rubric, 'When He drinks the Deaconess,' of the chalice.

Thus far of the translations from the Syriac. But the part which will be most interesting to general readers will be the introductory notice. This is divided into four chapters: the first tells the history of the Christians of S. Thomas till their first intercourse with the Portuguese; the second relates to the Synod of Diamper; the third—which will come nearest home—tells of the intercourse between our own Church in India and the Syro-Jacobite communions in Malabar; the fourth narrates to us Mr. Howard's own experience among his brother-priests in Travancore.

While we cannot but feel that, especially in his preface, he treats rather harshly some harmless peculiarities of that Church, Mr. Howard seems to have endeavoured, in his personal dealings with it, to give it a true idea of ourselves, while, at the same time, trying to impress on them how needful is a higher education for their ecclesiastics. Bishop Heber, in his dealings with the Christians of S. Thomas, appears to have joined wonderful tact to great love, so that their own internal dissensions at that time were, by the mutual consent of both parties, submitted to him, and he was only prevented from arbitrating by his sudden death. The proceedings of some fanatics, either being, or professing to be, connected with the Church Missionary Society, may be read in Mr. Howard's book: we cannot waste space upon them here.

A practical question to those of our brethren in India is this: ought they, or ought they not, if otherwise debarred from the reception of the Blessed Sacrament, to receive it from the Metropolitan (or his priests) of Cranganor? There is no formal expression of heresy in their liturgy: we are told by all those who, with any knowledge of the subject, have had intercourse with them, that they would willingly sign a formula which should represent the creed of Chalcedon. At the same time, a liturgy which commemorates, as saints, the arch-heretics Dioscorus and Barsumas—how could one join in?

The next volume which we have to mention, shows the interest which the laity are beginning to take in the offices of the Eastern Church. It is rather a pity, we think, that Mr. Hatherly should call his translation the 'Divine Liturgies of John the Golden-mouthed,' though in a smaller type and in a

parenthesis we read S. Chrysostom; because such a title is rather likely to repel those who might otherwise have been attracted by the intrinsic beauty of the offices themselves. A more singular slip of the pen is in the announcement that the liturgies in question are translated '*from the Greek and Russian.*' Mr. Hatherly, with most laudable diligence, submitted his version to the H. G. S. of S. Petersburg, but of course it was not from the Russ but from the Slavonic, that his version was made.

The great difference between this and former translations is, that the two liturgies of S. Chrysostom and S. Basil are, where they differ, printed in parallel lines. These two so closely resemble each other, that without any great difficulty such a comparison is possible; but to parallelize the other liturgies of the Eastern Church, as was first done by Dr. Daniel, and (as we think), misled by him, by Mr. Neale in his *Tetralogia Liturgica*, gives occasion to a great deal more trouble than profit.

We have, however, some faults to find with Mr. Hatherly's version. In the first place, it would seem almost incredible that one so deeply imbued with love for ancient liturgies should, in the Psalms which he reprints, follow the comparatively wretched and meagre Bible version, instead of taking that—confessedly almost equal to the Vulgate—from the Prayer-book. Again: we suppose that when the same words occur in the same sense, there is no appeal from the language of the Prayer-book in the first place, and from King James's translation in the second. Therefore we are sorry to see the *Kyrie* in the Deacon's part translated *Master*, and not *Sir*. Again: the Missal Litany of the Eastern Church had been, till within the last twenty years, named after the Russian fashion, *Ectinia*. We had hoped that such a barbarism—barbarism, we mean, so far as regards another language—had been entirely dropped. We suppose that the reason why it is here re-introduced is because the translator imagined that the true word *Ectene* might be pronounced *ectene*. Suppose it were, the barbarism would not be greater than it is. And these points are not of small importance. When the employment of sanitary commissioners first began, it was said by all men who cared for the purity of the English language, that the adjective ought to be spelt, as it had been always spelt till that time, *sanatory*, not *sanitary*. The multitude carried the day; alleging that they had a right to receive the term through the French, rather than from the Latin direct. And the result is, that now, translating our own word back into Latin, the city aldermen wish, and (of course) the *Times*, following them, advises, that diseased cows should

be sent to *Sanitariums*. What will English be thirty years hence? Anyhow, in the one changeless science, theology, let us keep, as nearly as the genius of the language will allow, to the original words in which any liturgical formula was conceived.

We confess that we do not quite understand the note attached to that which is called the prayer of S. Chrysostom in our Prayer-book. The translator says, 'It is impossible to preserve the syllabic beauty of this prayer in an English translation.' As we think, the version in the Prayer-book is the very perfection of the change of one language into another. And then again in the Eastern doxology, the 2d clause is thus given: 'Both now, and aye: and to ages of ages. Amen.'

Why, in the name of common sense, *aye*, instead of *ever*? Mr. Hatherly must know perfectly that from the very first time that the doxology has been said in what we now call English, *ever*, and not *aye*, has been the word employed.

The next book that stands on our list is, even in its present unfinished state, a great contribution to liturgiology. Just now, people's eyes have been fixed on Ethiopia, neither very pleasantly as regards that country or our own. Nevertheless, half barbarous as the Christians there now may be, their liturgies are of very great importance. They are, to the Protestant liturgy of S. Mark, what that of S. Chrysostom is to the liturgy of S. James; and, probably, what the old Gallican was to the primitive Ephesine. But in investigating them, it is not so much the difficulty of the language (for, compared with Slavonic, Armenian, or Georgian, it is not difficult), but the almost impossibility of procuring good manuscripts; while the edition printed at Rome in 1548, is not only *modified* to suit Ultramontaniam, but (probably from a pure want of knowledge on the part of the printers) abounds, to an almost incredible amount, in misprints. Renaudot tells us as much; though that great scholar, with modesty equal to his learning, tells us that, of the languages with which he was acquainted (now they happened, which he does *not* tell us, to be two and twenty) Coptic was not one with which he was most familiar. Mr. Rodwell who, by the present publication, ought to have a great increase of fame,—anyhow, which any liturgical scholar would most care for, deserves it—adds, that there are sometimes as many as thirty misprints in one page of this edition of 1548. The writer of the present article does not profess to be acquainted with Coptic, except to the same degree that an ordinary lad of ten years old might be with Greek. But it needs even less than that to appreciate the great addition which Mr. Rodwell has made to our liturgical knowledge.

All our acquaintance, hitherto, with the Ethiopic form of the liturgy, derived its source from Renaudot. He, in his collection of Oriental liturgies, translated the ordinary canon of the Abyssinian Church. Mr. Rodwell has done very much more. He has, in the first place, given us that canon from a comparison, it would seem, of more trustworthy manuscripts: then, the liturgy—which we may as well call by its Coptic name,—*Kedusse*, of ‘the Lord the healer of the sick;’ then, that of S. Mary; with a few notes from others of the twelve Ethiopic offices. We will make a few remarks on all. Only, so far as this Review may venture to do so, we desire, on behalf of English liturgical scholars, to thank Mr. Rodwell for this noble work; and to express our desire that he may give us, not only Baptismal offices, and the Hymnal of Jared, but whatever else may be most noteworthy in the Ethiopic books.

In the very first page, we have a singular expression, which Renaudot slurred over. In the Introit, we read: ‘Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than *hail*.’ The Abyssinians, unacquainted with snow, could have had no distinct idea represented to them by a foreign name of a foreign thing. The master of the great Ethiopic scholar, Ludolf, when he first saw snow in Europe, called it *meal*.

All through this liturgy, that of S. Mark is compared with it in the notes: and, through the most singular list of Saints, as for example, ‘Abraha and Atzeba, Caleb, Gabri-mascal, ‘Constantine, Fressenci, Degane-michal, Nawai, Christos, Ya-‘gebe-zion, Amdi-zion, David, Theodore, Isaac, Andrew, Amda-‘Jesus, Zarcus, Jacobus, Baida, Mariam, Alexander, Amdab-zion, ‘Naod, Lebna, Deghel,’ we have full explanations in the note. But we think that Mr. Rodwell should not have so taken it for granted that others would have the same acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of Ethiopia, as to give no explanation that the great Coptic saint, Tekla-haimanoth, was to that country what S. Basil was to the Eastern Church, S. Benedict to Europe in general; S. Dominic or S. Francis to their respective orders.

While we are on the subject of these most valuable notes, one remark occurs to us. To trace the connexion of this *Kedusse* with S. Mark’s Liturgy, was, of course, the all-important point. But we must regret that the editor did not also quote from (for that he had studied it is sufficiently plain) the liturgy of S. Cyril; itself a development from that of S. Mark; and, as a development, in various respects approaching nearer than its prototype to the common Ethiopic *Kidussee*. We have said before, and we repeat it now, that, putting the primitive Eastern liturgies out of the question—those, namely, of S. James, S. John, S. Mark, and S. Thaddeus, and allowing to



S. Chrysostom and to S. Basil all the superior authority they ought to have from being living rites, S. Cyril's is, in our opinion, the most valuable of all offices. Indeed, had the Church of Alexandria retained that, as the Church of Constantinople retains S. Chrysostom, it would be difficult to say why one should be held in more esteem than the other.

Some of the Ethiopic prayers are very beautiful; we will give one or two specimens. The following is—

*'The Prayer at the Breaking,*

'O God, Maker, giver of all things, perfecter of all things, container of all things, whom angels and archangels worship, powers and dominations, heaven and earth, the sun, and moon, and stars, and all grades of being; for from the beginning all subjection, majesty, and dominion are His! He who was rich in all things made Himself poor of all; love drew down the mighty Son from His throne, and brought Him to the death! Oh victim, who resisted not those who dragged Him along, and bent His neck to the slaughterers! Oh Lamb, that was dumb before His shearers! Oh patience, that opened not His mouth in His suffering, before those who smote Him! Oh bread, which came forth from the treasure which Joseph bought, and found therein the precious gem of the onyx! Oh bread, that came forth from the virginal chamber! This sign of His cross, which is separate from this bread, is not separate or different; the form, and softness, and taste, are one. As the form of this sign of the cross is not separate or different from this bread, in like manner His deity is not separate or diverse from His humanity; thus Thy majesty was commingled with our meanness, and our meanness with Thy majesty, O Lord our God!

*'The Deacon says,—Pray.'*

*'Priest.*—To our latest breath let us hear this word of eucharistic consecration. In it let us seek a refuge; in it let us find reconciliation; in it let us make our boast; for it is the coming of the Son out of the heaven of heavens on high for judgment and for mercy; so that this bread is at once a refuge and a tribunal, and the merciful one. At this perturbing word the soul trembleth, and my members quake, and the doors of my heart within me are opened. Lo! this bread is broken! Lo! this table is prepared! Let him that will receive come, and delay not. But first of all humble your souls, and purify your hearts.

*'If any be polluted or unclean, let him withdraw.*

*'The People say,*—According to Thy mercy, O our God, and not according to our offence.

*'If any one hath fallen into a sin, let him not forget it, for it is not forgotten.*

*'If any one hath habitually lightly esteemed this sacrament, let him not draw nigh; he is forbidden.*

*'This bread which is seen is not as earthly bread; it is the fire of the Godhead.'*

The ensuing is the Invocation in the liturgy of Dioscorus.

'Then the Jews apprehended and placed Him at the bar of judgment, to whom archangels bow down with fear and trembling; they crucified Him on the tree, and nailed Him with nails and smote His head with a reed; they gave Him vinegar to drink for His thirst, who had given Israel to drink from the square rock, to each a fountain. He who cannot die, died; He died that He might abolish death; He died that He might give life to the dead, that He

might give them hope by the word of a covenant. They took Him down from the tree, and wrapped Him in linen clothes, and buried Him in a new tomb; on the third day He rose again from the dead; He went where His disciples were assembled, and showed Himself to them in the temple of Zion, and in forty days ascended up into heaven, having commanded them, saying, Await ye the promise of the Father; and in fifty days He sent down upon them the Holy Ghost like fire, and they spake in the speech of all the lands. Even so in like manner send down the same Holy Spirit upon this bread and upon this cup, that He may make the bread the holy body, and this cup the blood of Thy side, even as thou didst say, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh My blood shall be with Me, and I will be with him.'

We have already introduced our readers to the first volume of the 'Acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.' The third, and we presume the last, has now appeared. We confess to being a little disappointed in it; it is from no possible fault of the editor, but simply because documents of the time concerning which we want to learn the most, the quarter of a century which succeeded the capture of Constantinople, seem, for some reason or other, very scarce. Of the three volumes, the second, we think, is the most interesting. It is a goodly octavo of nearly 600 pages, and embraces the Acts of the Œcumenical Patriarchs—Nilus, 1379; Antony IV. 1389; Macarius (restored), 1390; Antony IV. (restored), 1391; Callistus II.; Xanthopolus, 1397; Matthew I. 1398.

Some of the more prominent features of these Acts are worth notice. The first, perhaps, in importance is the rising power of the Church of Russia. As our readers are aware, that Church was not formally independent, till, by the unanimous consent of the Patriarchs of the East, Moscow, under its then Metropolitan, Job, was, in 1589, constituted a separate Patriarchate. But still, about 1300, in all its internal affairs, Russia seems to have been virtually independent of Constantinople; nor was the consent of the Œcumenical Patriarch always asked before the consecration of a Metropolitan of Moscow. The first signature in Slavonic, occurs in a document connected with some alleged misdoings of the Metropolitan of Iconium, in June, 1380. Pæmen, 'Metropolitan of Great Russia,' appends his signature in his own language. The order which the Metropolitans observe, is the following:—After the Patriarch, Theophanes, of Nicæa; Joseph, of Heracleæa; Isidore, of Thessalonica; Sebastian, of Joannina; Nilus, of Zosopolis; Antimus, of Wallachia; Alexius, of Varna; Matthew, of Tzernitza; Pæmen, of Great Russia; Paul, of Dercus. The rank which Joannina, Varna, and Tzernitza take, shows the strength and reality of that young life which the Eastern Church, while the sands of Byzantine empire were running out, was drawing into itself.

Another remarkable feature of these Acts is the multitude of

' conversions ' from the Latin to the Orthodox faith. Despots of the Egæan isles ; small princes in Peloponnesus ; noblemen who had probably, by Venetian influence, Latinized, come in by shoals at a time when, humanly speaking, they had everything to lose, and nothing to gain, by the change. Of course, union between two branches of the Church will never be brought about after this fashion, by driblets ; only, if Rome is rather given to pique herself on the units she attracts, let Constantinople have the same amount of credit placed to her side of the book. The formula, in all cases seems to have been the same. Rome has not a monopoly of Ultramontanism. Here is a profession of faith made in December, 1382 : when a radius of thirty miles from S. Sophia would have limited the whole temporal power of the East.

' We believe in One God, &c. [that is, the Nicene Creed without the Latin addition], and we reject the addition made by the Latins to this holy Creed, that which saith that the Holy Ghost proceedeth also from the Son ; for we believe and confess that He proceedeth from the Father only. And we reject also all those their customs, their polity, and conversation, as agree not with the Apostolic Church, and the laws of the holy Apostles, and of the holy Fathers : and we accept and believe all things that the Holy Church of Constantinople believes ; and with our whole heart we approach our most holy Lord, the Œcumenical Patriarch, and the Holy and Great Synod around him. In the month of Dec. indiction the sixth.

+ Stefano da Monte    Στέφανος ταμδυντε  
Σίγνου | 'Οργέντας  
της | γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ +

Then, again, the union of archbishoprics shows how the Turks were pursuing their conquests. Thus we have, in 1385, Gangra united to Ancyra ; in 1386, Corinth to Christianopolis ; in 1387, Amastris to Heraclea ; in the same year Chalcedon to Cyzicum. It is not the less wonderful that, with the Ottomans almost at the gates of Constantinople, archbishops and metropolitans should have been so eager after the vain titles of Exarch and Most Excellent ; exactly as now there are one or two who assume to themselves the title of Exarch of the Black Sea. But, after all, is this one whit more absurd than the fierce contest between Canterbury and York for the primacy of All England ; or the pride which the Archbishops of Bourges take—or took—in their double courts, one as metropolitan, one as primate, an appeal lying from the former to the latter.

It must be observed that there are some wonderfully amusing things in the long list of documents of which we are speaking. In 1380, a certain priest, named Constantine, seems to have given a brother priest a good thrashing, for which, by rights, he ought to have been deposed ; but the patriarch Nilus forgives him this time, and makes him promise, in writing, that

he will either not beat priests any more, or, if he does, be deposed quietly. Some years after he *was* deposed, but whether because of his pugnacious propensities or not is not stated.

A document of about 1390 ought, we certainly think, not to have been printed. It is albeit a formal confession of some poor monk, who having been guilty of sins enough, seems to have come to the Patriarch for absolution. The document is sufficiently official to show that it was not intended as a private confession, and therefore was rightly deposited in the archives of the great church. But there is something that goes against one's moral sense in ripping up the secret sins of a man nearly five hundred years after he has gone to his account; and the names are given also.

The 'Novaia Skrejal,' which has been a favourite hand-book of Russian liturgiology, here appears in a much enlarged and improved shape, under the editorship of MM. Korableff and Sinakoff. It is a remarkably handsome octavo, of 600 pages, and will be valuable to any student of Oriental rites, even should he not be acquainted with Russ, in consequence of the great number of engravings of church plate, vestments, &c. which it contains: one in particular, at p. 552, representing an Eastern procession, is of singular beauty. The original author of the 'Skrejal' was Benjamin Krasnopuff. Born in 1739, he became, in 1768, Prefect of the Alexandro-Neffsky Seminary; in 1770, Archimandrite of the Nicolaefsky Monastery; in 1774 he was raised to the bishopric of Olonetz; in 1775, Abbot of Archangel; in 1798 to the archbishopric of Nijni-Novgorod, where he died, in the odour of sanctity, March 16, 1811, thus happily escaping a sight of the miseries which the next year was about to inflict on his country. This work is divided into four parts. The first treats of the material fabric of the church. Here we have engravings of an Eastern church externally, an internal ground-plan, an altar prepared for the liturgy, chalice, altar cross, interior view of bema, paten, asterisk, iconostases, dikerion, trikerion, &c., censer, vials, &c. The second book is devoted to the hours and the liturgy; the third to holy orders; the fourth comprises all other sacraments and rites. The book does the S. Petersburg press the greatest credit.

One observation more we may make: the inestimable advantage which Lequien in his list of Eastern bishops would have derived from having had access to these Vienna documents, can hardly be overrated. We think it is not too much to say that, after all the persevering and energetic pains which that great scholar took to make his work as perfect as he could, fully half the names of prelates

mentioned in these Acts were unknown to him. We had intended to take one list given in the volumes we are considering, and to point out name by name, with how many of them the great French Dominican was unacquainted. But this is rather the kind of task which each scholar, interested in the Eastern Church, must himself undertake, in his own copy of Lequien.

We are glad to see that Mr. Neale's 'Five Liturgies' has reached another edition. In this, a somewhat awkward appearance, occasioned by the binding up in one volume of what were originally separate pamphlets, has been rectified: the notes are fuller; and, in comparison with S. Mark's Liturgy, the parallel passages of S. Cyril—as we have said before, probably the most valuable of second-class liturgies—have been given.

We had occasion to recommend to our readers the first volume of Denzinger's *Ritus Orientalium*, &c. The second volume has since appeared. It contains: the Sacrament of Holy Orders, after the Use of the Alexandrine Jacobites, the Syriac Jacobites, the Maronites, and the Nestorians. In the latter, we are glad to see that Mr. Badger's book, so far as it relates to this subject, is translated at length. There is rather an amusing note, at p. 266, where the editor, unable to understand the Syriac word, having translated it *pallium* in the text, says, 'Anglicè est, *surplice*.' Nevertheless, we incline to believe that Badger is right. After this follow very elaborate offices of the Armenians, with their fourteen orders. Then we come to Marriage, according to the Coptic rite, the Syro-Jacobite, the Nestorian, and the Armenian: in the latter, to any one unacquainted with the order of making Chatshpoch—the introduction of the bride to the bridegroom may seem strange. The Sacrament of Prayer-oil closes the second volume of the work, for which the deepest thanks of all liturgical scholars are due to Dr. Denzinger.

We must not conclude without saying a few words as to the progress which has been made since we last spoke on the subject—in the work of reunion.

Russia is preparing herself for this great work, and that in the best of ways, namely, by bringing in the wanderers from her own fold. Some years since the *Christian Remembrancer* gave an account of the old faith and the principal sect of dissenters in Russia; how, because when, at the invention of printing, innumerable errors were found in liturgical manuscripts, and were corrected by that great man, Mion, the Laud of Russia, there were those who thought that even by the confession of an error in spelling the infallibility of the Church was denied; and so, according to the old story, would say *mumpsimus* instead of *sumpsimus*. In the last century the usual remedy of persecution was tried

against them, and their numbers increased. Of late years—for the sect is very poor—government has printed for them a copy of their own liturgy, with all its blunders; and the Holy Governing Synod licensed a certain number of priests to say that liturgy with all its foolish—they were not more than foolish—mistakes. We ventured to prophesy that this would be the way to bring in these wanderers. They have flocked in; but the great event of the past year in Russia is that which took place at Moscow at the end of June. On S. John Baptist's Day, at Trinity Church, in that city, two bishops of the sect, Onyphrius of Broiloff, coadjutor of their metropolitan (who takes his title from Belokrinitz), and Paphnutius, Bishop of Kolomna, together with three other dignitaries, were received into the orthodox Church. The venerable Metropolitan of Moscow was exceedingly anxious to perform the office himself, but his health, the heat of the weather, and the length of the prayers, rendered that impossible. His Vicar-Bishop, Leonidas, of Dimitroff, therefore undertook his place. Four of the ecclesiastics who had been born dissenters were immediately confirmed; the fifth, Onyphrius, having been born in the Eastern Church, and lapsed to the sect, was received without any such rite. The next day all five received the Blessed Sacrament during the celebration of the Liturgy, and so became, in the fullest sense of the word, incorporated into the Eastern Church.

---



ART. VII.—*Faith and Life: Readings for the greater Holy-days and the Sundays from Advent to Trinity, compiled from Ancient Writers, with Notes on 'Eternal Judgment,' and Christ's Sacrifice.* By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A. Fellow and Assistant Tutor of University College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1864.

THIS is a small book, and also an incomplete one; for the author tells us in the preface that he hopes to follow it up by another volume for the Sundays after Trinity and the Saints' days. We shall be glad to hear that this first series of readings has received such a welcome at the hands of the public, that his hope may speedily be fulfilled. In ordinary cases we should have waited for its fulfilment before undertaking the review of the work. But the present case calls for no such delay. The point of the book, which we intend chiefly to lay hold of, is sufficiently brought out in the work as it stands. It is, in fact, the object Mr. Bright has in view, rather than the manner in which he has carried it out, that demands our attention. If the present volume only took rank with the multitude of devotional manuals, we should not have spared the space of an article to it, but have simply commended its excellence and usefulness in a few words among our 'Notices of Books.' Its title, however (which, by the way, is truly a title, giving the drift of the book; and not a mere flag of distinction), exhibits its importance; for it points a finger at the grand controversy of this present age.

Before giving expression to the thoughts which the title of this book suggests, we will make the reader acquainted with its plan and substance. In a preface of some thirteen pages Mr. Bright deals with the subject of which his book is an illustration; and since it is that to which our own remarks will chiefly apply, we shall postpone further comment to the notice we must take of the bulk of the volume. The 'Readings' are arranged upon the plan of taking up the leading doctrine or event of the day, or else the salient points of teaching put forth by the collect, epistle, and gospel, and quoting select passages from early Christian writers bearing directly upon the subject. The more important Holy-days are distinguished by having prefixed, as a sort of devotional introduction, a series of extracts from the Breviaries of Paris, of Milan, and of Rouen. In some cases these are preceded by a number of Scripture texts, 'taken,' as the preface informs us, 'solely from the Old Testament, in order to illustrate its Christian meaning.' The plan which Mr.

Bright has adopted, and judiciously carried out, is useful in many ways. It accomplishes his leading purpose, which is to provide a private manual for the Christian, that shall enable him to understand and profit by the revolving year of the Church, not only as inculcating Christian duty, but also as exhibiting the complete circle of Catholic truth. But this is no new thing. The special merit of Mr. Bright's book is that it draws its supplies exclusively from ancient sources, so that the reader, as he takes up the book on each Holy-day, has his intellect informed by the wisdom, and his heart refreshed by the piety, of the ages when wisdom and piety were joined together in loving and fruitful union. A double advantage accrues from this. On the one hand, the intimate relationship between sound theology and pure devotion is kept ever present to the mind; and on the other, the Churchman goes forth from the place of private prayer to the place of public worship, with a clear perception of the design of the day's service. Moreover, to the layman this volume is particularly recommendable. In these times of book-stall theology, consisting in part of Dr. Colenso's querulous demurrings to all religious teaching which neither reaches him through the fogs of German speculation, nor can trace its origin to a question from a puzzle-headed Zulu; in part of bundles of vapid platitudes, supposed to be evangelical, and which affect a puritan quaintness by the oddity of their titles, it is well that gleanings from the fields of patristic and scholastic divinity should be put up into small parcels for the general use. Seeing that the distinctions between the modes of instruction addressed *ad clerum*, *ad scholas*, *ad populum*, respectively, are fading away, it is very much to be desired that the form into which they become merged should be raised to as high a level as possible. If all are to sit down to the same table, at least let the common food be wholesome. It is therefore a cause of satisfaction to find antique boards, red edges, tinted paper, and a moderate price combined in a volume which contains the golden words of S. Chrysostom, the fervid eloquence of S. Leo, the earnest counsels of S. Bernard. The tone of the common day-talk assumes that the ordinary layman knows somewhat of theology; it is therefore advisable to put him in the way of becoming something of a theologian.

The clergy, too, may be placed under an obligation to Mr. Bright by this volume. The multiplication of sermons, consequent upon the increased and increasing vigour of church work, has brought about a thinness of matter in original discourses, and a prodigious spread of the practice of cribbing, that is to say, of borrowing without acknowledgment; as witness the brisk trade that is being driven in lithographed sermons, and

the market-value put upon bundles of legible manuscripts. Of course the idea of a clergyman is that he is a learned divine; and of his sermon, that it is the offspring of his own brain, nourished to produce it by well-digested reading. But the parish priest who is over-worked, and consequently under-read, cannot bring either himself or his discourse quite up to this standard. His conscience forbids him to crib, and at the same time urges him to provide the best possible nutriment for his flock. He knows that in the many-volumed ancient writers there is precious metal, only he has not time to clear it from the dross (for even the Fathers, be it admitted, did not write all fine gold from title to colophon) and sort it out under proper headings for ready use; and yet, if he could but work the mine, he might judiciously avail himself of its wealth, and own, without shame, the fact of his indebtedness. There have not, indeed, been wanting learned and industrious labourers to work the mine for him, and place its treasures at his command. The *'Catena Aurea'* of Aquinas, the *'Notes on the Greek Testament'* by Archdeacon Wordsworth, the *'Commentary on the Psalms from the Primitive and Mediæval Writers,'* compiled by Mr. Neale, are samples of such undertakings. But these take the text of Holy Scripture as it stands, and string together the quotations in a parallel line with it. Another method of selection remained to be tried, namely that which should be guided by the sequence of the Christian seasons, and cluster its treasures around the Holy-days of the Church. It is the especial merit of Mr. Bright's book that it carries this method into practice. In so doing he has made an important addition to the number of 'helps' towards the composition of sermons. Not, indeed, that we suppose he had this purpose in view; but his volume may well subserve this purpose, and is certainly a more legitimate source of assistance than many which profess to give it. While it is difficult to understand how a man of a nicely tempered conscience can preach another's sermons as his own, or even appropriate the ideas of another, and offer them as original; yet he may, without compunction, enrich his sermon by a quotation from an ancient writer, and plainly acknowledge the author, and take the benefit of following out the line of thought which is thus suggested. Of such pertinent and suggestive passages the book before us presents a well-assorted store; and although, beyond question, it be desirable that a clergyman should make independent explorations among the Fathers and School-men, yet a second-hand acquaintance through Mr. Bright's pages is better than—what we fear is, in many cases, the only alternative—no acquaintance at all.

One or two specimens may serve to give our readers a con-

ception of the plan of the book. We will take the first—Advent Sunday. Three extracts from the Ambrosian, and two from the Parisian Breviaries, form the introduction. The reader will be struck with the marked difference in style between the two office-books, so far as these quotations go, and also the close resemblance between the tone of our own collects and the passages taken from the Breviaries of Milan.

‘Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that the most glorious Advent of thy Son may both wash away our sins, and bestow on thy people peace and salvation; who liveth and reigneth,’ &c.—*Ambrosian*.

‘O Holy of holy ones, spotless mirror of God’s majesty and image of His goodness; cause that iniquity may be abolished, and everlasting righteousness brought in.’—*Parisian*.

Then two subjects are set down for meditation. I. ‘The two comings of Christ.’ II. ‘The second Advent.’ The former is illustrated by a passage, of somewhat over a page in length, from S. Augustine, Sermon xviii. In a note, a quotation from Archbishop Trench’s Cambridge Sermons is introduced. And this gives us an opportunity of remarking that no small portion of the value of Mr. Bright’s book lies in these foot-notes. They are neither too numerous, nor too lengthy; but either by a Scriptural reference, or by a brief quotation from some valued writer, or by supplementing needful explanatory matter, they greatly enrich the ‘Readings,’ and serve to make them a source of much knowledge and deep interest, as well as of devout thought. To the latter subject, ‘The Second Advent,’ are appended three passages, all of which deal with the doctrine of Eternal Punishment by way of warning, and as a basis of exhortation to repentance. The first is from the Epistles of S. Basil; the second and third are from S. Chrysostom. Of these two, the former is taken from the second and third Homilies on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, and is a good example of the liberty of abbreviation which Mr. Bright, in the preface, claims to exercise. As the passage, or rather fusion of passages, stands in his book, it reads off with perfect connectedness; and no one would suppose that what fills but a page and a half in this little volume has to be sought out of two distinct homilies, and half-a-dozen demy octavo pages, in the original. In the matter of translation Mr. Bright, so far as we have checked him, is vigorous and free, yet with due fidelity to the text. We will, however, take a single example for criticism:—

‘Ἄλλα δέδουκας τὸ φορτικὸν τῶν ῥημάτων; Μὴ γὰρ, ἂν σιγήσῃς, τὴν γέναν ἰσβέσας; μὴ γὰρ, ἂν εἴπῃς, ἀνῆψας; Ἄν τε εἴπῃς, ἂν τε μὴ εἴπῃς, ἀναβράσσειται τὸ πῦρ. Λεγέσθω συνεχῶς περὶ αὐτῆς, ἵνα μὴδὲ ποτε ἐμπέσῃ εἰς αὐτήν.—S. Chrys. in Ep. II. ad Thes. Hom. ii.

‘But dost thou fear the offensiveness of such words? Hast thou then, if

thou art silent, extinguished hell? or if thou speakest of it, hast thou kindled it? Whether thou speakest of it or not, the fire will boil forth. Let it be continually spoken of, that thou mayest never fall into it.'—*Library of the Fathers, translation.*

'Are you afraid of the words, as painful to hear? Ah! but does your silence about hell quench it? does your speaking of it kindle it? Whether you speak of it or not, that fire will burn fiercely; speak of it habitually, that you may never fall into it.'—*Faith and Life, p. 5.*

The Oxford translation is certainly closer than Mr. Bright's, and although the latter reads smoother English, yet there are two points in which we venture to think that the more literal is also the more expressive rendering. The word *φορτικόν*, when translated by 'offensiveness,' at once brings before the mind that kind of objection which the fastidious and unbelieving in every age raise against any enlargement upon the terrors of hell: it *offends* their polite ears. But this is lost, or at least is not so forcibly represented, in the expression 'painful to hear.' Again, the word *αναβράσσειται* is not only more exact, but also more graphically, rendered, 'will boil forth,' than by the freer phrase 'will burn fiercely.' The one rendering brings before the imagination the *λίμνη ἡ καιομένη πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ* ('the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone') of the Apocalypse, the other suggests but an ordinary furnace.

The other quotation from S. Chrysostom is brief enough and beautiful enough to allow of its repetition here.

'If we were not threatened with that fire, if no immortal punishments were awaiting us, still the mere fact of being alienated from Christ, the gentle and the loving, who gave Himself up to death for us, and suffered everything to rescue us from that punishment, and reconcile us, who were enemies by our transgressions, to his Father—this is greater than any punishment, and sufficient to arouse our souls, and induce us to be continually watchful.'—*S. Chrysostom on Compunction, i. 10.*

In most cases two subjects are chosen for 'Readings,' to be appended to; but there are several instances of only one subject; e.g. 'Holy Scripture,' for Second Sunday in Advent; 'Holy Orders,' for Third Sunday in Advent. There is one case of three subjects—viz. the First Sunday in Lent, under which—1. 'The Accepted Time.' 2. 'Ministerial Encouragements.' 3. 'The Temptations of our Lord;' are set down for illustration. The first of these is a passage from S. Chrysostom's Homily on the Epistle for the day, with especial reference to the words, 'Behold! now is the accepted time: behold, now is the day of salvation.' The second likewise takes its thought from the epistle (the epistles, we observe, generally have the preference in suggesting subjects; they, rather than the gospels, have a doctrinal bearing), and is an extract from S. Gregory Nazianzen, Apologetic Discourse, c. 117. The third referring

to the gospel of the day, is taken from that part of S. Augustine's Commentary on Psalm lx. (according to the Latin; lxi. according to the Hebrew) in which the word-play of the original, 'De te sibi mortem, de se tibi vitam,' gives the translator into English a good deal of trouble to decide upon the most distinct form in which it may be rendered. It is hard to judge between, 'Of thee for Himself death, of Himself for thee life,' which is Mr. Scratton's version in 'Library of the Fathers,' and, 'Death for Himself from you, life from Himself for you,' which is Mr. Bright's manner.

One other example, and we shall have fairly put the reader in possession of the plan and execution, the purpose and spirit of this work. We will select the highest Christian Festival, on which Mr. Bright very properly bestows the largest share of attention, and the greatest space in his volume. The title is, 'Easter Day, and through the Octave.' Thirteen texts from the Old Testament usher in the 'Readings.' These are followed by a series of ten extracts from the Breviaries, five from the Ambrosian, three from the Parisian, two from that of Rouen; the fifth, from the Breviary of Milan, is worth quoting:—

'O God, who through Thine Only-begotten Son hast overcome death and opened unto us the gate of everlasting life; fulfil our desire which has been conceived by Thine inspiration, that as we have been born again in Him, we may in Him partake of the resurrection; who liveth,' &c.

The reader will at once recognise in the former part of this prayer (down to 'inspiration') the very thoughts, and almost the very words, of the Collect for Easter-Day in our own Service-book; whilst in the remainder, he will detect a very concise expression of the leading idea which occupies the Collect for Easter-Even. It is interesting to note the proofs that one and the same spirit of devotion animates the various liturgies of the Church; and it is but reasonable to conclude that this oneness of spirit is the consequence of oneness of faith, and that Catholicity of doctrine makes itself known through Catholicity of worship. Our Collect for Easter-Day, we need hardly remark, is derived from the sacramentary of Gelasius, A.D. 494; and the Collect for Easter-Even is an original composition, introduced at the revision consequent upon the Savoy Conference in 1661. The selections from ancient writers, which are grouped round the one truth, 'Christ Risen,' are eleven in number, and much greater in length than under any other festival. As might be expected, they are the choicest examples of ancient eloquence upon the highest subject of Christian thought. They are culled from the pages of S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, and the gentle S. Cyprian.



The passage from this last Father is taken from his treatise 'On the Mortality.' Mr. Bright's translation, like that of Mr. Thornton's in the 'Library of the Fathers' in this passage, follows the text of Fell. In freedom and vigour we think it equal, perhaps in some places superior, to that of Thornton. We are not quite sure whether Mr. Bright would not have done well in adoption the reading of the Benedictine, Baluzius, in preference to that of Bishop Fell, in the sentence which stands thus in the two versions :—

'Si in Christum credimus, fidem verbis et promissis Ejus habeamus; et non moriemur in æternum, ad Christum, cum Quo et victuri et regnaturi semper sumus, læta securitate veniamus.'  
—Fell.

'Si in Christum credimus, si fidem verbis et promissis Ejus habemus, et non morimur in æternum, ad Christum, cum Quo et victuri et regnaturi semper sumus læta securitate veniamus.—Baluzius.

It is unnecessary for us to proceed further in our examination of the contents of this volume. We have given examples enough to make the reader acquainted with its method and substance; and from those examples he cannot, we think, avoid the conclusion that 'Faith and Life' is a book which ought to take a high rank among devotional manuals, and may be usefully associated with the best of like works which are to be found in the Anglican Churchman's Oratory, as giving prominence to doctrinal, while they dwell chiefly on experimental religion. Before, however, we lay it aside, we must take the opportunity of remarking at some length upon the great question of the day which the title of this book indicates, and which, both in the preface and the appendices, is thoughtfully handled by Mr. Bright.

'Faith and Life:' under this heading may be ranged the whole vast struggle of ideas and tendencies which, in the view of the philosopher, is comprehended under the history of mind; and in the view of the theologian, under the history of religion.

It would, of course, be absurd to attempt, in the brief space that a single article can command, to treat of this struggle with any degree of depth or elaboration; but it may not be altogether unuseful to set forth a few thoughts which the present phase of the contest may suggest, and to conduct, by reflection, an occasional ray of light from the history of the past, and from the state of distant religions, to give more clearness to the view. That the remarks thus made should be both general and trite is almost inevitable; and there is left for the writer but the humble hope that his observations may at least possess the truthfulness, though they may not avoid the insipidity, of truisms. 'Faith and Life' is a formula which states the two great factors that go to make up the sum of what we understand

by the orthodox idea of religion, and it also expresses the relation in which they stand to each other as cause and effect. It has always been considered the best mode of testing the soundness of any system of theology, to search and see whether, in its practical working, the faith be the efficient cause of the life, and the life the proper consequence of the faith. For, although the two can only properly stand to each other in one relationship, namely, that which we have just described, yet various perversions of them have, from time to time, gained ground; fostered in their growth by influences seated within the man himself, and also to be found in the circumstances in which he may be placed.

In the history of religion, Faith, by which, of course, we understand Belief, and Life, by which we mean moral conduct, are found to exist in every possible variety of connexion and severance. In one age Faith is placed in a sort of rivalry with morals, as though good conduct had to be regarded with considerable jealousy, lest it should be found in some instances to exist where orthodox belief was wanting, and thus faith, as a real force in guiding the world aright, should lose credit, and seem to be not so essential after all. In another age, Faith and Life co-exist, but do not co-operate. Men grasp a creed firmly: they also live circumspectly; but an attentive observer will find that the creed is not the cause of the morality, but that men yield their assent to a certain formula of belief, or a set of religious doctrines, out of a traditional reverence for it as having been held by their forefathers, while their moral code is the result of balancing together the forces of expediency, common-sense, public opinion, and what is called natural justice, with a notion of the fitness of things as a make-weight. In another age, Life, or moral conduct, is thrust into the foremost place as being of supreme importance; while belief is either tolerated on the condition that it does not interfere with moral conduct, or else is denounced as trammelling it with arbitrary regulations, hindersome to its free action. Lastly, in every age, but more conspicuously in some ages than in others, the true view of Faith as bearing fruit in life; of a man's creed being the guide of, and reason for, his conduct, finds place, and its existence works as a regulator upon the tendencies of religious thought which, at one time, would fly off into antinomianism, and at another, into the heresy of Pelagius.

We have, however, spoken somewhat too narrowly in assigning these positions to their respective ages, as though they occurred and recurred in set historical periods. We must remember that there is a strong natural tendency to one or another of them to be found in different races of men, under

different conditions of climate, different forms of polity, and with different national experiences. It would be unphilosophical, for example, to shut one's eyes to the fact that Faith, as distinct from Life, has always received higher consideration among the peoples of the east than among the peoples of the west. Upon this point, however, and upon others, we shall find opportunity to touch in dealing, as we proceed now to do, with the four relationships of Faith and Life sketched out above.

The first of these relationships exhibits Faith as superior to Life, not in the proper form of superiority, which consists in the necessary priority of cause to effect, but in the superiority which involves rivalry and the depression into an inferior position of the less esteemed quality. Religious belief has, at certain times and among certain peoples, obtained an independent position, leaving moral conduct in very low esteem as beneath the regard of men who range along the high levels of abstract doctrine. This was the earliest form which the separation of Faith from Life assumed. The circumstances of the early Church (for, of course, our remarks pre-suppose the Christian society as their field of observation, although their principles apply equally well to all society, and all times, in which religious belief has taken form in doctrine, and moral conduct has been moulded into an ethical system) were peculiarly adapted to produce this form of divorce. The very first step to be taken by the Apostolic College, after they had 'tarried in Jerusalem' until 'they were endued with power from on high,' was to give such definiteness to the belief, which each convert should profess at his baptism, as should leave no room for mistake, or the up-growth of inconsistent varieties of creed. As long as poverty and persecution kept the Church free from the selfishness, which needs some sunshine of prosperity to encourage its growth, doctrine maintained its rightful position as the guide and teacher of holy living. But as soon as the Church expanded and became more at ease, then the strict sequence of practice upon belief, as of a conclusion upon its premisses, was felt to be irksome to the commoner sort of minds. They did not like, albeit they could not impugn, the inevitable logic which sternly drove the man who professed the right faith into exemplifying his orthodoxy by his moral life. To assert that moral rectitude was in itself unimportant would of course have been too bare-faced an avowal of their real craving for license. There was, however, an opening for looking at moral conduct in a light which would have the effect of weakening its force in connexion with faith. Moral conduct was certainly not the specialty of the Christian religion. It had been inculcated by every religion that had sought to sway men's minds: it was, in fact, the aim of all religions, how

wide soever their respective attempts at hitting it might have been. The grand thinkers of classical heathenism had theorized, and reasoned, and allegorized very beautifully upon it. This being so, it was not difficult to lead men of weak principle and biassed minds to dissociate morals from the Christian religion, on the ground that morals were common to all religions, and it was only a question of degree how perfectly each religion developed their practice; but that Christianity was a creed, and that a man was distinguished as a good Christian by the completeness and accuracy with which he held its various articles. Thus orthodoxy, which ought to lead to orthopraxy, came in time to move in a different plane.

To favour this kind of perversion of the true relationship between Faith and Life there existed certain sufficient influences in the early Church, and whenever the same perversion has re-appeared, these influences, though somewhat altered in guise, will always be found near at hand. In the first place, it was impossible for men in those days to deny that Christianity was a creed, a belief, a body of religious doctrine. As such it had been handed to them, as such they had received it. The world had not lived long enough to have its senile ignorance imposed upon by the bold assertions with which the enemies of the doctrinal character of Christianity seek to delude it at the present day. No one could have dreamt of saying, as is now repeated even to weariness, that Christianity was only a moral code, more beautiful, more perfect, more elevated than all antecedent codes, but still like them in its practical purpose and undogmatic character. Such maudlin sentimentalism as one is continually meeting with in current popular literature, which talks of the Christianity of Plato or of Mohammed, of Confucius or of Zoroaster, would not have been suffered to cloud the air with its worthless fogs. Whatever extravagances early promulgators of error may have run into, they at least had sufficient logical acumen to perceive that parallels can never meet, can never produce a coincidence. So it was that the ancient forms of theological misbelief took Christianity for what it was—a faith, a creed; not for what it was not, a series of moral precepts strung upon a thread of history. Thus it came to pass that the uneasiness which the close relationship of Faith to Life produced in wayward and self-sufficient minds found relief by parting off moral conduct as of secondary and far inferior importance to the Christian theologian, and drying up and hardening into lifeless abstraction the creed of Christians. The articles of their faith were not explained away, but their definitions, which ought to have presented them more clearly for men to observe them and live by them, as a pattern is hung up for imitation, only served

to shut them in within the impenetrable walls of sophistical argument. Faith, in fact, became enshrined for the veneration of Christians, and was not brought forth for application to their daily life. It was simply objective as a creed, not subjective as a working principle. In this abstracted condition doctrine was not disliked; it was rather too well liked; that is to say, it was cherished with an unreasoning fondness. Just as we may suppose the case of a man taking an insane fancy to water-pipes,—not because of their use as ducts of refreshing streams to him, but simply for their being pipes,—and showing his absurd fancy by diverting the life-giving current from them and keeping them in useless preservation; so were doctrines taken from their proper intention of being channels of vivifying truth to human minds in daily life, and laid by enfolded for curious inspection and the unprofitable expenditure of words.

Moreover, we must not pass by the very important influence which the native place of Christianity had upon the shape which its earliest perversions took. The first steps aside from the straight path of orthodoxy were such as an oriental mind would, and which an occidental mind would not, take. To seek to abolish doctrine, to sneer at creeds and canons and standards of faith because of their dogmatic form, was the very opposite to what the innovators upon dogmatic truth in the East would think of doing. In fact it is hardly correct to apply the expression innovators to them, for they had too much reverence for dogmatic statements to attempt to break in upon them, to treat them slightly, to disparage their venerable claims to respect. They, on the contrary, paralysed the usefulness of doctrine by treating it only as doctrine. They would contemplate doctrines, they would dreamily spin fine webs around them, they would carry on much logomachy concerning them; but they never would push a troublesome doctrine rudely down before them, and trample it under foot. An Oriental, by severing his life from his faith, makes his faith useless, but he preserves it as a faith with reverential care. A Western, on the contrary, as soon as he finds that his life is working independently of his creed, declares his creed to be a worthless incumbrance, and proceeds to sweep it away. How diametrically opposite are the tendencies of the East and the West in matters of faith may be illustrated by the turn which dissent takes in each quarter. In the East dissent is conservative; in the West, it is destructive. In the East, when men feel bound in conscience to sever themselves from the great mass of their co-religionists, it is because the mass has become reformed. If in their schism they should fail to take with them the essentials of worship, they will patiently do without them. If they have no priest they will do without a priest,

and without an altar, and without a sacrifice. In the West, dissenters are men of new fangled notions; they do not hesitate to destroy everything in belief and practice that is old, and make all things anew for themselves. They will make sham clergy, and celebrate sham sacraments, and erect sham altars. A single instance from each will illustrate what we mean. In the East, the *Raskolniks* of the Russian Church—the ‘schismatics,’ for that is the meaning of the word—are otherwise called *Starovbiadzi*, or ‘old-faith people;’ they are divided off into two sects, the one called *Popovtzi*, or those with clergy, who receive runaway priests from the orthodox communion, and so keep up their priestly offices; the other, called *Bezpopovtzi*, or those without clergy, who are too rigid in their schismatical conservatism even to receive the renegade priests of the orthodox communion. Neither sect dreams of starting a priesthood of its own, and the latter patiently, but resolutely, contents itself with just so much of the religious offices as a layman can perform. In their chapels some venerable man, who takes the deacon’s part, stands before the apparent screen, which is really the final wall of the church, without hope of the holy doors ever expanding, or of his eyes ever being blessed by the sight of the long-lost altar.<sup>1</sup> In the West, the sect of Irvingites, with their many orders of clergy, their elaborate ritual, and their abundant affectation of sacramentalism, form a striking contrast to the *Raskolniks* of Russia.

The fact is, that between the two states of contemplation and action, the Oriental chooses contemplation, and easily allows action to subside into inertness: the people of the West, on the other hand, choose action, and deride contemplation as the pastime of dreamers and indolent visionaries. These dispositions, when brought to bear upon religion, incline their respective possessors either to the side of Faith or to the side of Life; and so it comes to pass that in the East men hold the Catholic faith with intelligence and accuracy, while their lives slip by in neglect of good works; and in the West men have the vaguest perception of the doctrines they profess, and treat an exposition of them with impatience, as profitless, while they spend their lives in an energetic practice of Christian duties and labours.

But besides the influence of race, we must not pass by unnoticed the influence which special circumstances, apart from race and age, conspire to exercise so as to produce an exclusive regard for Faith and doctrine apart from the moral results which are their proper fruit. Whenever disturbances in the atmosphere

<sup>1</sup> See ‘Le Raskol. Essai Historique et Critique sur les sectes religieuses en Russie.’ Paris, 1859. Also Dean Stanley’s ‘Eastern Church,’ p. 404.



of religious thought have brought out any one particular dogma, or set of dogmas, so that it becomes a flag of a sect, then belief, so far as it may be deemed co-extensive with such dogmas, is separated off from moral conduct and acquires an adventitious importance. A man receives consideration according to the firmness with which he maintains the distinctive tenets, not (as ought only to be the case) according to the consistency with which his life flows on in harmony with those tenets. Thus we see that the divorce of faith from life, and the elevation of faith to the disparagement of life, may easily come to pass at any time and amongst any people.

Another phase of the co-existence of Faith and Life demands some attention. It is that in which they are seen to stand side by side, unconnected by any relationship as that of cause and effect, but at the same time not in rivalry, but simply as factors of the sum of human character. It is not unusual to find men declaring their belief in a series of abstract dogmas, and calling this their religion, at the same time that they profess to guide their life and actions by rules of expediency or common sense, without even the pretence of referring their conduct to their religion as its efficient cause. If we look for examples of this kind of severance we must search for them amongst individuals rather than amongst religious bodies, or those who are banded together by peculiar tenets. What would have been called the 'steady-going Churchman' of thirty years ago is a type of the class we refer to. This title was usually applied to a man who accepted the Church of England in the lump, who took up his Prayer-book just as he found it, and considered that between its two covers there did exist, though in what form and upon what principles he could not precisely say, his faith. Half-a-sheet of paper would have been more than enough to contain all he could write down by way of explanation of his religious views, and yet he held his faith with a firm grasp, and would have stoutly resisted any attempt to wrest it from him. But his life was ruled after another fashion. In its integrity it came up to full satisfaction, and no one could gainsay the fact that the man who went to Church on Sunday was a fair man, and an honourable, to deal with on a week-day. In saying this we do not mean to assert that such a man's religion had no influence on his conduct: this would be absurd and untrue, for beyond all doubt religion does exercise an influence even upon those who submit themselves to it with cold indifference; in fact, a positive counteraction must be set up against religious influence for those who are brought within its reach to remain entirely unaffected by it. But what we intend to point out is that no connexion between the life and the faith was acknowledged

as one acknowledges the connexion between effect and cause. The man himself did not account for his conduct by pointing to his religious principles, nor did he perceive how they could have a real bearing upon his daily conduct; in short, to him Faith was one thing, and Life another.

There are, however, instances of that kind of divorce of Faith from Life which we are now considering, to be found in those religious communities whose distinctive tenets are the impracticable theories of web-spinning theologians, which tangle up the movements of weak minds, but through which minds of vigour burst without difficulty and without remorse. The Calvinian dogmas are a case in point. No man ever yet lived his daily life upon Calvinian principles. Such a thing is simply impossible; the very first exertion of the will sweeps the whole cobweb of that dusty heresy into space. What can be made of a religion which bans all human effort, the whole reasoning whereof is included in a vicious circle, and has been pretty fairly summarised by an old woman in these words, 'You couldn't do any 'good, if you would, and it wouldn't do you any good if you 'could'? And yet there are some very hard heads and very shrewd minds that will point to Calvinism as their creed; and perhaps they would not be shocked if they were told that their creed was a dead letter to their life; for it is not at all certain that people dislike an ineffectual religion. In fact, to keep a religion is what men very readily assent to do, and inasmuch as Calvinism is a religion which can be kept but cannot be used, it answers the purpose well,—much better, indeed, than a religion which can be used; for this may become troublesome by being energized into inconvenient activity by the workings of conscience or the admonitions of religious teachers. The truth is, there is amongst men a perverse liking for theories and systems of belief, the very nature of which forbids their being brought to bear upon active life; and the large mass of mankind (unless something more practical be pressed upon their attention) will readily acquiesce in calling themselves by the name of a profession, the principles of which stand clear of personal conduct and morality. The chapter 'Of the Opinion of Necessity as influencing Practice,' in Butler's *Analogy*, exhibits the philosophical aspect of this absurd tendency, and points out how people will persist in holding to a theory which is contradicted at every turn of practical life.

We have, however, not yet touched upon the phase of disunion of Faith from Life which characterizes the present age. We have not yet spoken of Life without Faith. This position of the two factors is very distinct from any other both in its causes and its results. As regards its causes, they are to be sought, not

in the indifference of the age, which is the reason that lies at the bottom of the kind of severance last noted—that severance which puts asunder faith and life, but does not tend to destroy either, or even to subordinate the one to the other—but they must be looked for in that impatient activity of our high-strung civilisation, which is intolerant of whatsoever does not lead to tangible results, and measures everything by a coarse sensuous standard of practical utility. The effect of this tendency is at once felt when principles or doctrines come to be considered. For inasmuch as principles and doctrines are at the roots of moral conduct, and form the hidden foundations of those activities which are comprehended under the idea of Life, their value is held in small regard. As they can neither be touched, nor tasted, nor handled, nor even seen, our materialistic generation contemns them as unsubstantial chimeras. *Cui bono?* is the petulant inquiry with which every one is met who attempts to gain the popular ear, while he discourses of a moral principle, or a theological dogma.

It may be worth while to examine somewhat methodically the causes that have been at work to produce the strong dislike to doctrine which possesses so many minds at the present day. If we look around us and seek for the leading defect in the constitution of the majority of minds (for defects are quite as much characteristic of an age as positive qualities) we should say that it was a want of logicalness. People do not reason out, but leap to, their conclusions, and the impulse of their liking gives the spring to their leap. If some show of having arrived at their conclusions by a more reasonable road be thought expedient, it is supplied by *ex post facto* argument; for the most part it is dispensed with. Now this defect in logical power is not itself a primary cause, but rather is a result acting as a mediate cause. Men have discarded logic, thinking they have found a more ready way of reaching the same ends; and consequently, through disuse, the logical faculty has become weak. The maxim 'the end justifies the means,' is often condemned, but its condemnation arises from its being misapplied, not from its inherent faultiness. The end, if it be good, cannot but justify the means, as the good fruit cannot but justify the tree. What has brought the maxim into discredit is its having been quoted to support the besetting error of what is called a practical age, which is eager to accept a useful result, no matter how corrupt the apparent means. We say apparent, for the mistake lies in taking for granted that what appears to be the cause of an effect is its cause, and this mistake is made without question, over and over again; whereas the very fact that the apparent cause is wrong while the effect is right, ought to excite inquiry into its

claim to be considered a cause, and this inquiry would lead either to clearing the cause of its apparent corruption, or of discovering that it was not the real cause, but an accident overlying the true cause. Men, however, are very unwilling to jeopardise, as they think, a beneficial result by scrutinizing its means; fearing that if the means were found to be faulty the result would vanish. But this is unreasonable, for assuredly no real good that has been brought to pass can suffer by having its causes investigated. In the physical world it often has occurred that the origin of some useful or beautiful work has been for long ages misunderstood; but when more careful and intelligent research has discovered the error and detected the true origin, the work itself has not been damaged in its beauty, or impaired in its usefulness. So is it in the world of morals and theology. This dread, however, has operated mischievously in deterring men from ascertaining the good causes of good effects; and through shrinking from the exercising their logical faculties in this behalf, these faculties have become weak and inert. The evil has gone further still: from disliking to inquire into causes, or principles, or doctrines, men have grown to disesteem the doctrines themselves. What they begin by disliking to investigate they end with declaring unworthy of investigation. Hence it comes to pass that, in the region of matters religious, Life becomes dissociated from Faith, as an effect dissociated from its cause; and Faith is pushed aside, as a useless and obsolete bundle of notions which it is not worth while to pay attention to.

There is another reason at work to produce the severance of Faith from Life, and the setting up of Life and the trampling down of Faith. We hinted at it when we spoke of the impatient activity of our high-strung civilisation. An insatiable hunger for display, that is to say for visible and tangible results, distinguishes our age. Anything like substructure, foundation, hidden principle, fundamental doctrine, is regarded with jealousy as taking away so much time and substance which might be worked up to produce effect, show, material result. This, indeed, is very childish. It is the folly of the learner of music, who, because practising scales is not playing a tune, pettishly declares scales to be useless: or like the beginner in drawing, who will not give his attention to straight lines, and curves, and vanishing-points, because a picture does not immediately come of them. But this feature of the age is more than childish when it shows itself in religion; it is mischievous, and its mischievousness manifests itself in a variety of ways.

The first and most prominent is the anti-doctrinal spirit. There is abroad an unreasoning abhorrence of doctrine. To lay down a doctrine with any degree of positiveness and clearness is

denounced sometimes for one reason, sometimes for another. One reason often urged is that doctrine is not a part of Christianity, but rather a human hardening and moulding up of Christian precepts into distorted forms. It is declared that the intention of the Founder of Christianity was to make men good and happy, but not to perplex their minds with abstract principles, and burden their consciences with articles of belief: which is much like saying that the object of a builder is to build a house, but that he need not trouble himself about the laws of gravitation, or take pains to inquire whether the site be on sand or on a rock. They support their objection by pointing out how virtuous and happy men can be who cannot understand doctrine, or who positively reject it. But this is begging the question: and it lies with the objectors to show that men cannot be benefited by doctrine unless they can understand it; and that he whose intellect refuses assent to doctrine is not, in spite of himself, a proof in heart and life of the good effects of doctrine. If the ignorant rustic who holds out his arms to preserve his balance, as he walks across a narrow plank, do not understand the principle of equilibrium, is he the less preserved from falling by his ignorant obedience to that principle? Did the blood of those prejudiced physicians, who rejected Harvey's theory of circulation, flow through their arteries and return through their veins according to his theory, or not? The singular blindness of these objectors to the fact of their own obligations to Christianity, as a doctrinal system, has been so forcibly exposed in the pages of a contemporary, that we shall take leave to quote its words.

'These theorists have to be taught as theorists scarcely more presumptuous have been taught before, that Christian morality is a blessing which can only be enjoyed by the world as a consequence of Christian faith. What misleads them is that this rule is true of a community, but is not necessarily true of an individual. Some of the brightest examples of what a Christian life should be, have been, and still are, men who have renounced all but the mere pretence of Christian faith. The fact in their case is that their morality was formed before their intellect went astray. Virtue had become easy before faith had become difficult. Thus it has come to pass that Christianity has been reproached with her own success, and the morality which her preaching has produced, has been employed to discredit its truth. But what the world has not yet seen is a society in which the dogmas which these gentlemen despise have lost their hold upon all classes and both sexes, and which yet retains its morality or even its civilization through two or three generations. The virtuous heretic or infidel, the child of believing parents brought up in a believing community, is not difficult to understand. But in order to prove the disconnexion between "the objects of a Christian life," and dogmatic teaching, which is the cardinal principle of this new school, it is necessary to produce a generation born of unbelieving parents, nurtured amid an unbelieving community, and which yet has grown up even to that measure of Christian self-restraint which we are able to recognise in our lukewarm age.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'The Church in her Relations to Political Parties.' *Quarterly Review*. No. cccxxxv. July, 1865.

Another reason pressed home very closely by the anti-dogmatists is that the holding and insisting upon doctrines or articles of belief tends to breed uncharitableness and intolerance. They declare that the effect of creeds and standards of faith is to foster bigotry in those who maintain them against those who reject them. Now this sort of objection is at once plausible and contemptible. It is plausible, for it affects to be put forward in the interests of the most distinctively Christian virtue—charity; and on this pretence it is found to be very taking with youthful and candid minds. It is contemptible, because it goes upon the unfounded assumption—an assumption which its promoters know to be unfounded—that a man cannot entertain strong convictions of his own without feeling unkindly towards those who differ from him. If this were so, then charity would be abandoned to the sceptics. But the fact is that true charity and the genuine principles of toleration can only fully be developed by those who have a faith to hold by. The charity of sceptics is very often the expression of a selfish desire that, inasmuch as they cannot believe themselves, belief may be held in depreciation.<sup>1</sup> It is as though cripples should propose that all men hobble on crutches. And so with their vaunted toleration. ‘Be tolerant,’ cry they: of what? of believers? No: of doubters. Each toleration is simply a truce among sceptics; and if one of the convention break the truce, and take to believing, he is at once denounced as a renegade to bigotry. It is natural enough for unbelievers to deal gently with unbelief, but it is not deserving of very high praise; in like manner the toleration by sceptics of scepticism is at best but a virtue made out of a necessity. In fact, charity and tolerance only become praiseworthy when they cease to be interested; and no man can really claim credit for either the one or the other who stands in need of their extension to himself. Hence it is plain that they only can practise charity and toleration in their highest and purest forms who stand upon the *terra firma* of a fixed and definite faith. It is also plain that they who are so advantaged ought to elevate into duties the virtues which they have no call to cultivate for the sake of interest; and thus the orthodox Christian is, of all men, most bound to be tolerant and charitable, and especially to those who are neither the one nor the other. And yet this is hard. ‘Then comes the last and most difficult lesson of love, to make allowances even for the uncharitable. For surely below all that

<sup>1</sup> ‘Let no man think that he can be tolerant or charitable as a matter of self-indulgence. For real charity and real toleration he must pay a price. So long as they are merely negative—so long as they mean only the permission to every one to think his own thoughts, and go his own way—the world will bear them,’ &c.—*Sermons by F. W. Robertson*. 4th Series. Sermon xxi.



‘ uncharitableness which is so common, there is often a germ of the life of love ; and beneath that intolerance, which may often wound ourselves, a loving and a candid eye may discern zeal for God. . . . Earth has not a spectacle more glorious or more fair to show than this—love tolerating intolerance ; charity covering as with a veil, even the sin of the lack of charity.’<sup>1</sup>

The disparagers of Faith draw largely upon history to produce specious testimony to their assertion that doctrines are fruitful of bigotry and intolerance. They point triumphantly to the riotous proceedings at the councils of the early Church—to the factions which have, from time to time, torn Christian society to pieces with their doctrinal disputes, to the ill-concealed bitterness with which men of different persuasions regard each other, and especially to the fact that this bitterness is in proportion to the tenacity with which they cling to their respective creeds. Now we have no quarrel with the facts thus alleged : they are only too true. But we distinctly demur to the inference drawn from them. It does not in our minds, nor, we assert, in the reason of things, follow that what men contend very earnestly about is good for nothing, because it is made a subject of contention ; and that, as a corollary to this proposition, the only truths of value are those concerning which all are agreed. For, in the first place, to a candid mind, the fact that people strive very strenuously for a certain opinion is, *primâ facie*, evidence of the importance of that opinion, and this evidence can only be overset by particular demonstration to the contrary. Would the body of Patroclus have been precious if no one had cared to pick it up ; and did it cease to be of value because Trojans and Greeks fought keenly for its possession ? We are inclined to suspect that men first lose all appreciation of a doctrine before they begin to feel horrified at the earnestness with which it is defended. And then, again, the grand talk about the few great moral principles which all consent to uphold, is merely threading together platitudes upon a string of false sentiment. There is no principle, how great or important it may be, but what, at some time or other, has been controverted ; and as regards religion, those doctrines which are believed in by the largest number of Christians happen to be those over which the fiercest conflicts have been waged. Take, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity : upon it reposes the whole fabric of Christianity as a faith, and yet its complete development and perfect consolidation into its place are the result certainly not of general consent, but of the most protracted

---

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Robertson : *l. c.*

and wide-spread struggle. The shallow theorists, who fancy they can readily lay a finger upon an elemental truth beyond dispute in moral science, should learn a lesson from the experience of the investigators in physical science. Analysts have been taught to be cautious about proclaiming any substance to be an element, simply by discovering the elements of which a substance, they had supposed to be elemental, is compounded.

When, however, we speak of the prominence given to Life at the expense of Faith as a characteristic of the present age, we must not too hastily condemn the age as worse than its predecessors, nor suppose that Faith is moribund amongst us. The fact is, that the especial fault of an age is chosen, by a curious custom, to stand as the mark of the age, although it may be counterbalanced by some conspicuous virtue. We need not, therefore, despair of our own period, because it is distinguished by a good deal of active hostility against formulated doctrines as such. A calm inquirer will find that we live in an age whose failings, in matters of religion, 'lean to virtue's side.' Indeed, the causes at work to lower Faith and raise Life as its rival, are only mischievous when they are applied to the connexion that should subsist between Life and Faith. How injurious soever, as a matter of experience, the craving for practical results may be, when excessively developed with respect to religion, yet no one can deny that, in itself, it is a much more desirable state of the public mind than a torpid indifference to good works, which reduces men to mere dreamy *faintants*. In like manner, the logical weakness of the leading minds of the period, although it be disastrous when the first principles of the faith come to be considered, and may, nay, has in many notable instances, imperilled the existence of Catholic truth as a power over the mass of men; yet, as a protest against the hair-splitting sophistry of the schools that used to treat morals as an exact science, and doctrines as units in the sum of orthodoxy, it has its use. Moreover, the loud and frequent profession of charity and tolerance, may, it is true, by its empty repetition, degenerate into a cant; but, as a reaction from the narrow and illiberal spirit which dwarfed men's mental vision, so that each looked at the world through his own key-hole and thought that all he saw was all there was to be seen, it must be hailed as a healthy change.

All these considerations may serve to tranquillize our minds, when disturbed by the fears which are not unnaturally excited by the bold and often irreverent manner in which cardinal doctrines are called in question, and arraigned before the very incompetent tribunal of popular opinion. Nay, we will go further, and will venture to assert that the outcome of all the theological

agitation, and especially of that rude intrusion of what is called common-sense between Faith and Life, will be a fuller and closer union of Faith with Life upon sounder and more Catholic principles. Take for an instance the doctrine of the Atonement, to which Mr. Bright devotes an appended note. This Catholic doctrine has suffered no little damage in its symmetry and practical usefulness by having been handled, at least in England, by theological writers who grasped feebly, if at all, the sacramental system of the Church. To arrange the acts of redemption as a series of grand events along the distant horizon of Church history, to surround them with a fence-work of dogma, but so to isolate them that they exhibit no traceable connexion with the ordinances of the Church Catholic, is in fact to misrepresent them and defeat their divine intention. Thus with the Atonement: it was like building a wall against the sun, or throwing a dam across a stream, to sever it from the Holy Eucharist in any practical treatise concerning it.

We cannot now stop to point out in detail how doctrine becomes practicable in personal religion, how personal religion draws its life from, and is saved from withering into a mere husk of outward observance by, its connexion with doctrine. In what manner Faith regulates Life can only be understood when the application of doctrine to practice through the system of the Church is made clear. To effect this object we believe is the work appointed for the present age, and we believe that the age is addressing itself to the work. Beyond all doubt men are waking up to the significance of the Church system, by which, though they slumbered in its midst, they have all along been surrounded. The very practicalness of the age forbids them any longer to acquiesce in a system the intention whereof they do not perceive; and although hasty and irreligious minds may conclude that such a system is really void of meaning because hitherto they have not detected its meaning, and proceed at once to sweep it away, yet the more sober, and that the major, part of men patiently search for a meaning, and their search is rewarded. For they can trace up the vital chords of connexion to their doctrinal origin, and discover how the current of spiritual life descends from the truth unseen, though believed in, to the visible acts of personal religion as they are worked out in the orderly system of the Church. Thus, while some to whom the Sacrament of Baptism has been a form and nothing more, thrust it aside with impatience because of its seeming emptiness and uselessness, others, more cautious and reverent, seek for the doctrinal spirit which gives it life, and find full satisfaction in the truth of sacramental regeneration. So, too, in the Eucharist; the meagre and barren idea of it, as put forth

by Zuingle, as only too sedulously maintained by the anti-sacramentalists within and without the Church, does not meet the desire of this age for the real, the true, the practical. No wonder, indeed; and if some men toss aside as a useless husk of a mere observance that which has been presented to them as no better, there is some excuse for their rashness; though, happily, the more thoughtful part treat it as they do the first Sacrament,—inquire where its life is hidden, and are recompensed by finding therein a present Saviour instead of a mere recollection of an absent Lord.

From this view, then, of the tendencies of the present age we gather hope, albeit there arise, now from one part, now from another, of the theological horizon a threatening cloud. If the spirit of our period incite the ill-balanced and illogical minds to divorce Faith from Life, and fling Faith aside as worthless, it acts on others with a contrary influence by urging them to bring Faith and Life, not merely into juxta-position, but into living union. If it impel a few unsteady thinkers to reject Catholic doctrine because, as mere doctrine, it seems to them unproductive of good results, it constrains the greater part to follow out doctrine into practice, and make practice speak forth doctrine. And that such hopeful views of what is too readily stigmatized as a degenerate and faithless age are not unwarranted, we need only advance in their justification that holy belief which is the Catholic Christian's sheet-anchor wherewith he rides out safely every storm of theological discussion—the belief in the abiding presence of the Divine Spirit, quickening and guiding the Church as fully and as watchfully now as when It endued with power the assembly of apostles at Jerusalem.

---

ART. VIII.—*The Gnostics and their Remains, Ancient and Mediæval.* By C. W. KING. London: Bell & Daldy.

WE hardly realize, in the nineteenth century, the influence and power of Gnosticism in the earlier ages of the Church. What we do know is chiefly through the writings of Hammond and Burton, and from quotations from S. Irenæus; but a real history of Gnosticism, in all its various phases, has not engaged the attention of any learned writer in our country; yet from its wide-spread influence in early times, as the parent of most of the heresies which corrupted the primitive faith, it deserves attentive investigation. Most persons are content with the general notion that its founder is Simon Magus, and its doctrines are extravagant perversions of the Gospel; which, having now passed away, leaving no trace behind, may be safely left in its obscurity, and that we need not disturb the clear waters of truth by stirring up its muddy depths. But this is really to take a very superficial view of the subject; it does not at all touch its true position as a phase of the spiritual and intellectual struggle of human powers to attain, by any and every means, the solution of the great question, 'What is truth?' Gnosticism extends far back beyond the time of Simon Magus, and, in a modified form, exists yet among some of the strange Mohammedan sects of the East.

The birthplace and real home of Gnosticism is the East; we find it pervading all the old theological systems of Asia. It is there that the traditions of the Creation, the Flood, and the Fall, retained the largest amount of truth, and were least corrupted; it is there, too, that the human mind began its earliest speculations on the Being of God, and the destiny of His creature, man. We shall not be hazarding a very bold conjecture if we point to India as the true birthplace of Gnosticism. Mr. King, following Matter ('*Histoire Critique du Gnosticisme*'), says truly:—

'That the seeds of the Gnosis were originally of Indian growth, and carried westward by the influence of that vast Buddhist movement, which, in the fifth century before our era, had overspread all the East from Thibet to Ceylon, was hinted at by Matter, and became apparent to me on a very slight acquaintance with the fundamental doctrines of Indian theosophy. To show this, the two systems, in their two most perfected forms, that of Valentinus and that of the Nepaulese Buddhists, are briefly described and confronted; and throughout innumerable points of analogy will be found indicated.'—*The Gnostics and their Remains*, &c. p. vi.

Starting, then, from this point, we ask what Gnosticism is, and what it professes to teach? What is the peculiar *Gnosis* that it claims to itself? The answer is, the knowledge of God and of man; of the Being and Providence of the former, and the creation and destiny of the latter. While the ignorant and superstitious were degrading 'the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made with hands,' and were changing 'the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature 'rather than the Creator,' the ancient Gnostics held purer and truer ideas. And when these corrupted and idolatrous forms of religion and worship became established, and popularly regarded as true and real in themselves, the 'Gnostics' held and secretly taught an esoteric theology, of which the popular creed of multitudes of deities, with its whole ritual of sacrifice and worship, was but the exoteric form. Hence all the 'Mysteries,' which almost if not all heathen systems possessed. Those initiated into these mysteries, while they carefully maintained and encouraged the gorgeous worship, sacrifices, and processions of the national religion, and even openly taught polytheism, and the efficacy of the public rites, yet secretly held something very different—at the first, probably a purer creed, but in course of time, like the exoteric form, degenerating. The progress of declination differed according to race, or habit of thought; in the East it tended to superstition, in the West (as we learn from the writings of Cicero) to pure Atheism, a denial of Providence.

This system was adopted likewise by the Jews, but with this great difference—that it was superinduced upon, and applied to, a pre-existing religion; whereas, in the other Oriental religions, the external was added to the esoteric, and developed out of it. In the Oriental systems the exoteric was the sensuous expression of a hidden meaning; in the Jewish the hidden meaning was drawn out of pre-existing external laws and ritual: in the former the esoteric alone was claimed as divine, in the latter it was the exoteric which was a matter of revelation. To repair this seeming defect, the Kabbalists, or teachers of the Hidden Doctrine, invented the existence of a secret tradition, orally handed down from the time of Moses. We may, of course, reject this assertion, and affirm that the Jews learnt the idea of a Hidden Wisdom underlying the Mosaic Law from their intercourse with the Eastern nations during the Babylonian Captivity; and we may further be assured that the origin of this Secret Wisdom is Indian. Perhaps we shall be more exact if we say that the Jews learnt from their intercourse with Oriental nations to investigate the external Divine Law, for the purpose of discovering its hidden meaning; for we do not for a moment



wish it to be thought that we denied, or even doubted of, a deeper meaning than the mere external one in almost all the precepts of the Levitical Law; both our Lord and S. Paul, as well as the universal voice of the Church, both in ancient and in modern times, bear testimony to the fact—to do otherwise would be almost to deny the Divine Wisdom in giving such precepts, and in ordaining such ritual.

Another difference between the Jewish and heathen Gnosticism was, that the Jews did not speculate on the creation of the world, on the Being of God, and of man, nor on the origin of evil; those things were revealed in Scripture, and therefore were not matters on which there could be various opinions. They adopted the text of Genesis implicitly; they only sought to enlarge their knowledge of it by Kabbalistic interpretations; while the heathen Gnostics and philosophers speculated largely on these matters, and generally lost their way in the search of light in the midst of darkness.

It is impossible to determine at what exact period this system commenced. The intercourse of Israel with the nations east of the Euphrates may be said to have begun with the Assyrian captivity, when the Assyrian monarch transplanted the people of Israel to 'Halah and Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes.' This, to adopt the common chronology of our Bibles, is about 720 B.C. In the following century, Manasseh, king of Judah was carried to Babylon; and in 588 B.C. Zedekiah, the last king, was taken prisoner, and the city of Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Babylonians. We give these dates, because it is clear, from internal evidence, that a system of investigating the Law of Moses, for the purpose of learning its hidden meaning, was in use even by inspired men long before the closing of the canon of the Old Testament. A very casual reading of Psalm cxix. for instance, will show us that this is the case. No one, speaking merely of the precepts and ritual of the Mosaic Law could use such expressions as we find there; but they are wholly in accordance with a search after a deeper wisdom. 'Lord, what love have I unto Thy Law; all the day 'long is my study in it. Thou, through Thy commandments, 'hast made me wiser than mine enemies; for they are ever 'with me. I have more understanding than my teachers, for 'Thy testimonies are my study.' The writer of these sentences and prayers is evidently one who is looking far below the letter of a precept, or the outward action of ritual. Whether written before or after the Captivity, it is a proof not only of the commencement of such a system of interpretation, but of a Divine authority for it.

To this class belong the two Books of Wisdom and Ecclesi-

asticus, both of which contain what we may call the morality of the Law; to these may be added some of the later chapters of Proverbs, of which we read (chap. xxv.), 'These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out.' We may fairly doubt the parentage here given, and may suppose the name of the Wise King was used by the 'men of Hezekiah,' in much the same way that it was by 'Jesus, the son of Sirach,' in his 'Wisdom of Solomon,' to give weight and authority to the book. This leads us to see what is the true meaning of the word 'Apocrypha;' not, as is popularly supposed, something of doubtful authority, or actually spurious, but a writing or book which purports to draw from the Mosaic Law its hidden and moral sense; the spiritual meaning hid under the letter.

A very great impulse was given to this Apocryphal school by the transportation of many thousand Jews to Alexandria; there, partly from their distance from Jerusalem, and therefore from the possibility of constantly attending the Temple worship, and partly from their contact with Platonic philosophy, there arose the necessity for a different style of interpretation of the Sacred Oracles. Two distinct lines of theology were pursued; one the Moral, the other the Mystic. In Judea there were three; that of the Pharisees, that of the Sadducees, and that of the Essenes. These latter were very similar to the Mystics or Therapeutæ of Alexandria. It was these last, the Mystics, both of Judea and Alexandria, who elaborated that remarkable system, known as the Kabbala.

We do not intend to enter into any description of Kabbalistic theology, further than is necessary for the purpose of elucidating Gnosticism, since we fully described it in a former volume of the *Christian Remembrancer* (vol. xliii. p. 345). The Gnosticism described by the early Fathers is a development of Kabbalism; the Gnosis of the latter was the mystery of Creation and Providence; that which followed the publication of the Gospel, added to the former the mystery of Redemption. In both the character was the same, it is the making *knowledge* the great object of all revelation; in other words, making salvation depend on a certain system of doctrine, and not on the sanctification of the heart and soul. This is, doubtless, the 'other Gospel,' against which S. Paul warns the Galatians, 'which is not another,' i.e. is no true Gospel at all. We must not, however, suppose that all those who are called Gnostic heretics, or who professed Gnosticism, were in every sense Christian; on the contrary, a large number were simply heathen mystics, whose Gnosis was derived from Egyptian or Indian sources. Speaking of Mithraic monuments, Mr. King says:—

'These may be considered as representing the purely Persian element, so important an ingredient in Gnosticism. The Mithras worship at first, indeed, makes its appearance as a distinct creed, said to have been introduced into Rome after the conquest of Pontus by Pompey, where, however, it speedily became so popular, as, with the earlier-imported Serapis-worship, to have entirely usurped the place of the ancient Hellenic and Italian deities. In fact, during the second and third centuries of the empire, Serapis and Mithras may be said to have become the sole objects of worship, even in the remotest corners of the Roman world. It was the theology of Zoroaster in its origin, but greatly simplified, so as to assimilate it to the previously existing systems of the West. Under this form it took its name from Mithras, who, in the Zoroastrian creed, is not the supreme Being Ormuzd, but the chief of the subordinate powers, or Amshaspands. Mithra is the Zend title of the sun, the peculiar domain of this spirit, and hence he was admitted by the Greeks as their former Phœbus and Hyperion. Thus Ovid, "*Placet equo Persis radiis Hyperiona cinctum.*" In the same character he was identified with Dionysus and Liber, or Phenaces, the Sun-God of the Asiatics, and his mysteries replaced the ancient Dionysia. How important the Mithraica had become in the second century appears by the fact recorded by Lampridius, that Commodus condescended to be initiated into them. With their penances and tests of the courage of the candidates for admission, they have been maintained by a constant tradition through the secret societies of the Middle Ages, and the Rosicrucians, down to the modern faint reflex of the latter, the Freemasons. On these heads more particulars will be given when their distinctive monuments come under consideration. My object now is to trace the gradations by which the Mithraic ideas merge into the Alexandrian and semi-Christian Gnosticism.'

—Pp. 47, 48.

The heathen Gnostics, in fact, collected a Gnosis from every quarter, accepted all religious systems as partly true, and extracted from each what harmonized with their ideas. The Gospel, widely preached, accompanied by miracles, having new doctrines, and enunciating new truths, very naturally attracted their attention. The Kabbalists, or Jewish Gnostics, like Simon Magus, found a large portion of Apostolic teaching in accordance with their own, and easily grafted upon it so much as they liked. Again, the Divine power of working miracles, possessed by the Apostles and their successors, naturally attracted the interest of those whose chief mystery was the practice of magic. Simon the Magician was considered by the Samaritans to be 'the great Power of God;' he was attracted by the miracles wrought by the Apostles, and no doubt he sincerely 'believed'—that is, after his own fashion. His notion of Holy Baptism was probably an initiation into a new mystery, with a higher Gnosis than he possessed before, and by which he hoped to be endued with higher powers; and so, likewise, many of those who were called Gnostic heretics by the Christian Fathers, were really not Christians at all, only they adopted so much of the Christian doctrine as accorded with their system.

'That the mysterious title Abraxas, said to have been devised by the Egyptian Basilides, means "Holy Name," has been fully demonstrated by Bellerman.

That the symbolical figure, embodying the idea, refers to the sun, is equally certain. Similarly, the Hindoo "Ineffable Name" is applied in the *Gaytri* to the "Fierce and all pervading Sun." Basilides was not by any means a Christian heretic, as the later Fathers found it expedient to represent him, but rather as his contemporary Clement relates, "a philosopher devoted to the contemplation of divine things;" in all likelihood imbued with Buddhistic notions, which the perpetual intercourse between Alexandria and the Indian coast had long before naturalised in Egypt and Palestine. Hence we sometimes find Mithraic and Abraxas amulets combined in the same gem, the finest example of which is a green jasper (Marlborough Cabinet), exhibiting on one side Mithras slaughtering a bull, on the other Abraxas himself. In the later philosophy, as we shall presently find in the case of Serapis himself, the primary idea of all the principal deities was explained as symbolising the solar luminary; and their numerous names designating, not separate beings, but attributes of one and the same. A truly Hindoo notion, whereby their apparently unlimited polytheism is reduced, for the enlightened Brahmin, to the acknowledgment of the One Supreme.

'There is very good reason to believe that, as in the East the worship of Serapis was at first combined with Christianity, and gradually merged into it with an entire change of name, not substance, carrying with it many of its ancient notions and rites; so in the West a similar influence was excited by the Mithraic religion. Seel (Mith. p. 287) is of opinion that, "as long as the Roman dominion lasted in Germany, we find also traces of the Mosaic Law; as there were single Jewish, so there were also single Christian families existing among the Gentiles. The latter, however, for the most part, ostensibly paid worship to the Roman gods in order to escape persecution, holding secretly in their hearts the religion of Christ. It is by no means improbable that, under the permitted symbols of Mithras, they worshipped the Son of God, and the mysteries of Christianity. In this point of view the Mithraic monuments, so frequent in Germany, are evidences of the secret faith of the early Christian Romans."—Pp. 48, 49.

We accept the fact mentioned in the last quotation from Seel, but we are disposed to deny the conclusion he draws from it. Those 'Christian Romans,' were most probably Roman Gnostics, who, admitting some Christian doctrine into their mysteries, and identifying Christ with Mithras, adopted the plan of all heathen Gnostics, outwardly conformed to the public religion, while in secret they taught and held their 'Mystery,' and this mystery contained many rites in imitation of the Sacraments of the Church. Not only was there a purification by washing of water, but there was also a parody of the Eucharist. S. Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 66), says, 'The same thing, in the mysteries of Mithra, also the evil demon imitated, and commanded to be done; for bread and a cup of water are placed in the mystic rites for one who is to be initiated, with the addition of certain words as you know, or may learn.'

We may remark here, by the way, that this frequent imitation of the Sacraments of the Church, as well as the perversions of its doctrine by these Gnostics, must have been the principal cause for bringing the former into disrepute with the heathen: these last confounding the Sacraments of the Church with those

Gnostic mysteries, attributed to the former the abominations of the latter; so that, possibly, the stories of sacrificing children, and the disgusting accounts of promiscuous intercourse alleged to have taken place at those mysteries, may actually be true. S. Augustin seems to allude to some such confusion when he says, "I know that the priests of "him in the cap" (*istius pileati*) used at one time to say, "our capped one is himself a 'Christian.'" If these Mithraic Gnostics were as largely diffused as Mr. King supposes, we can readily perceive how they would be mistaken for Christians, and their mysteries for the Sacraments.

The name by which the Gnostic deity was known is Abraxas, or, as it is often written, Abrasax. His figure appears engraved on gems. Mr. King, quoting S. Irenæus (Lib. I. c. xxiii.), gives the following description:—

"Basilides, in order to invent something more elaborate and plausible in the Gnostic speculative philosophy, pushed his investigation even to the Infinite. He asserted that God, the uncreated eternal Father, had first brought forth *Nous* or Mind; this the *Logos*, Word; this again *Phronesis*, Intelligence; from *Phronesis* spring *Sophia*, Wisdom, and *Dynamis*, Strength." Irenæus understands by this that his Quinternion signified five substances, Personal Intelligence, or Beings external to the Godhead; but it would rather seem that they stood for the personified attributes of the Godhead; forms of His working internally and externally. Again he asserted, "When the uncreated unnamed Father saw the corruption of mankind, He sent His first-born, *Nous*, into the world in the form of Christ, for the redemption of all that believe in Him out of the power of those that have fabricated the world (the Demiurgus and his six sons, the planetary genii). He appeared among men as the Man Jesus, and wrought miracles. This Christ did not die in person, but Simon the Cyrenian suffered in His stead, to whom He lent His bodily form; for the Divine Power, the *Nous* of the eternal Father, is not corporeal, and cannot die. Whoso therefore maintains that Christ has died, is still the bondsman of ignorance; whoso denies the same, he is free, and hath understood the purpose of the Father."—Pp. 34, 35.

Again:—

"That the name Abraxas properly referred to the Sun-God, or Mithras, appears from Jerome (Amos iii.): "As Basilides, who called Almighty God by the portentous name of Abraxas, and says that the same word according to the Greek numerals, and the sum of his annual revolutions, are contained in the circle of the sun, whom the heathen, taking the same sum, but expressed in different numerical letters, call Mithras, and whom the simple Iberians worship under the names of Balsamus (the Lord of heaven) and Barbelus (Son of the Lord)." This calculation is thus explained by Augustine:—"Basilides pretended the number of heaven is 365, the number of days in the year. Hence he used to glorify a 'Holy Name,' as it were, that is, the word Abraxas, the letters in which name, according to the Greek mode of computation, make up that number."—Pp. 78, 79.

1 We give these quotations from Mr. King's book; they are his, not ours, and he is answerable for the grammar and punctuation. When he does quote Greek and gives the original, he always omits the accents, and is sometimes not very correct in his translations.

S. Irenæus tells us of Basilides and his followers:—‘They use images, invocations, incantations, and all other things pertaining to magic.’ These images or figures engraved on gems are very numerous; Mr. King has given us engravings of a large number. Of these many represent Abraxas himself. He is portrayed generally as a composite figure, with the head of a cock, the body and arms of a man, frequently clad in a cuirass, with a shield on the left arm, and a whip in the right hand; two serpents take the place of legs. Of this composite figure Kellerman gives the following explanation. It is—

‘A Gnostic *Pantheus*, representing the Supreme Being, with five emanations marked out by appropriate symbols. From the human body, the usual form assigned to the deity, spring two supporters, *Nous* and *Logos*, expressed in the serpents, symbols of the inner senses, and the quickening understanding; on which account the Greeks have made the serpent the attribute of *Pallas*. His head—that of a cock—represents *Phronesis*, that bird being the emblem of foresight and of vigilance. His two arms hold the symbols of *Sophia* and *Dynamis*; the shield of *Wisdom*, and the whip of *Power*.’—*King*, p. 35.

Mr. King, however, is of opinion that *Abraxas* is identical with *Mithras*, each representing the sun, either in his (apparent) diurnal, or in his annual revolution. For, in fact, all theosophy may be reduced to the worship of the powers of nature, of which the sun and moon were the great deities, as being the apparent causes of growth and reproduction. Polytheism being, to the learned, not a multiplication of deities, but of the names of one deity: a separate name being given either to each apparent position of the deity, or to his peculiar function supposed to be exercised in his change of relation to mankind on the earth, caused by his different positions. Thus the functions of the sun are of one kind in spring, and another in autumn; to express this he was called by, and invoked under, different names. We have a striking instance of this in the ‘*Metamorphoses of Apuleius*’ (Book xi.), where *Lucius*, having been transformed into an ass, prays to *Isis*—the full moon then just rising;—of which he says:—‘Knowing that the all-powerful Goddess of Night, ‘excelling in the attributes of majesty all other deities, not only ‘extended her providence to human affairs, domestic cattle, and ‘the beasts of the field, but that things inanimate vegetated ‘under her influence, and even bodies in the earth, and in the ‘sea, and the firmament, obediently increased with her increments, and lessened with her wanings, I resolved . . . to offer ‘up my supplications to the august image, &c. . . O Queen of ‘Heaven, whether it be thou that art the benign *Ceres*, first ‘mother of the fruits of the earth . . . or whether thou art the ‘celestial *Venus* that hast associated together the sexes in mutual ‘love from the beginning of all things . . . or whether thou art



'that goddess, sister of Apollo, whose soothing remedies comfort women in travail . . . or, finally, whether thou art the triple-faced Proserpine, by whose hand the mortal limits of the earth's boundary are determined . . . to thee, whatever thy name . . . I offer up my prayer.' Now, as Apuleius represents Lucius, on account of his deliverance from his transformation by the power of the goddess, to be afterwards initiated into the mysteries of Isis, we shall perceive that he considered these four names—Ceres, Venus, Diana, and Proserpine, to be merely different names of the moon under different conditions, as one of the great powers of nature, and still further as identical with the Egyptian Isis; we have accordingly a very clear intimation of what the Gnosis of these mysteries consisted, viz. a simple acknowledgment and worship of the powers of nature under a multitude of different names, which the uninitiated understood as a multitude of distinct deities. Our readers will observe the curious fact that Lucius addresses the moon both as Ceres and Proserpine; mother and daughter, yet as one and the same.

If we also bear in mind that each of these names had a separate symbol, generally some animal; and that there was a like symbolical representation to each sign of the Zodiac, and consequently a combination of symbols on the sun's entering into each, we shall have no difficulty in conceiving the *rationale* of the exoteric plurality of deities, and of the esoteric doctrine of one, or perhaps two, principles of life contained under those different figures.

A further instance, and one more closely connected with our subject is found in the book of Enoch (chap. lxxvii.). The Archangel Uriel is represented as explaining the courses of the sun and moon; of which he says, 'The names of the sun are these: one Aryares, the other Tomas. The moon has four names: the first is Asonya; the second, Ebla; the third, Benase; and the fourth, Érae.'

While this worship of nature practically excluded the idea of One Supreme Deity ruling over nature, and controlling all by His Providence, it left those Gnostics, who prided themselves on their superior knowledge, a prey to the constant dread of the power and malice of evil spirits and demons.

A large proportion of the Gnosis consisted in either the practice of magic, or the using means to escape from the influence and malignity of evil spirits and witchcraft. The 'images,' or figures, that S. Irenæus speaks of, these engraved stones, which Mr. King gives, are most of them, if not all, talismans or amulets. The meaning of these terms, as given by Mr. King, will not be out of place here.

\* Although those terms are usually confounded together, their proper meaning is entirely distinct. Talisman is but the corruption in the Arabian mouth of the Greek *Αποτελεσμα*, the influence of a planet or sign upon the *native*; hence astrology is called *η Αποτελεσματικη*. Now the influence of every degree in each sign was typified by a fantastic figure or group, painted in the table of Myriogeneses. Hence by a natural transition the symbol itself usurped the name, Apotelesma, of the idea it was intended to portray. A Talisman was therefore necessarily a *sigil* engraved in stone or metal. An excellent illustrative example is that figured by Raspe, No. 354, where Abraxas, carrying the Nile-vase, is encircled by the ungrammatical invocation, *προς παντας ανθρωπον δοται χαριν τοις φερουσιν*—"Give unto the bearers favour in the sight of all men." Hence the talisman served both to procure love, and to avert mischief from its possessor. The latter alone was the object of the *Amuletum*, a word derived from *Amolior*, "to do away with" or "to baffle." Many natural objects both animal and vegetable, the stranger they were the better, had this power of counteracting the all-dreaded evil eye; and of such the most striking example is the fascinum of phallus, or the fist closed so as to convey an indecent idea. Pliny uses the word cyclamen: "which ought to be planted in every house, if it be indeed true, that where it is planted poisonous drugs have no power to harm; hence they call the flower *Amuletum*." Again, speaking of amber: "Infantibus adalligari amuleti modo prodest."—P. 115.

A custom exists, or used to exist forty years ago, in the north of England, to plant houseleek on the roof of a building 'for luck'; perhaps a remnant of the like superstition. In the East, to this day, the 'evil eye' is an object of intense dread; the steadfast look of a stranger on a child, for instance, a word of admiration for its beauty, will not only fill the mother with terror, but she will probably perform some action, or utter some words, as a counteraction to its supposed evil influence. Nor is it so very long ago that it was believed, even by some of our most learned and pious divines, that this hostile power residing in the heavenly bodies, could exercise its influence on man; we have a remarkable instance in a passage in Jeremy Taylor's exquisite funeral sermon on Lady Carbery: 'And those creatures 'which nature hath left without weapons, yet they are armed 'sufficiently to vex those parts of men, which are left defenceless and obnoxious to a sunbeam . . . or the unwholesome 'breath of a star looking awry upon a sinner.'

The feature of Gnosticism most interesting to us, is its very early connexion with Christianity; for we must repeat what we said before, that Gnostics were not originally a sect of Christian heretics, like the Arians, for instance, but that Gnosticism was a theosophy existing long before the Incarnation, and the preaching of the Gospel; and that the Gnostics only adapted so much of Christianity as accorded with their system, and suited their purpose. We may, for perspicuity, divide them into two classes, Jewish and heathen; the former were known as Essenes, Therapeutics, and Kabbalists; the latter, those initiated into one or more of the mysteries.

It is not a matter of wonder that these should readily adopt certain portions of Christianity, for they, considering knowledge as the end and aim of all religion, and seeking for it everywhere, were just as ready to take it from the Gospel as anywhere else. Besides this, the miracles that attended the first publication of the Gospel naturally had the strongest interest to those who both believed in, and practised magic. They saw in the Gospel a higher Gnosis, and in the Church a more wonderful manifestation of supernatural power, than any system or sect of their own could show; they therefore readily adopted the system, and desired to be initiated into its mysteries. Simon Magus is only a type of numbers of other Gnostics; 'he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.' Jewish, as well as heathen Gnostics, practised magic; they used charms, spells, incantations; 'curious arts,' as our translation renders τὰ περίεργα; those that used such things are styled περιεργούμενοι, and ἐξορκισταί; their books, that on one occasion alone were destroyed, were valued at a great price, 'fifty thousand pieces of silver.' It is probably to some of these books, and certainly to these acts, that Juvenal alludes (Sat. xiv. 96)—

'Quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem,  
Nil præter nubes, et cæli numen adorant;  
Nec distare putant humana carne suillam,  
Qua pater abstinuit; mox et præputia ponunt;  
Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,  
Judaicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuunt jus,  
Tradidit arcæno quodcunque volumine Moses.'

Pliny (xxx. 2) mentions a kind of magic founded by certain Jews named Moses, Jannes, and Jotapes. It is not unlikely that it is to the books of this latter Moses, and not to the Pentateuch, that Juvenal refers. They also professed to interpret dreams:—

'Qualincunque voles Judæi somnia vendunt.'

It does not appear that any of these books on magic have come down to us, though, if we may believe the stories of the Middle Ages, they were plentiful enough then; it is not improbable that the secrets of these books were contained in such language, and under such terms, as none but the initiated could understand: without the key the door could not be opened. The engraved gems given us by Mr. King, prove this; many of them bear incantations inscribed upon them, as well as symbolical figures, the meaning and use of which is to us generally unintelligible.

Mr. King mentions it as a fact, that very few really Christian gems exist; in the list of the great French collection, given by

Chabouillet, there are only four distinctly Catholic symbols, the Good Shepherd, the Dove, the Fish, and the Christa or Monogram; while the Gnostic are numerous; these last are often called *Jews' stones* in the Middle Ages, and were supposed to have strong medicinal virtues. These gems, plates of bronze and lead, rude medallions engraved with various Gnostic symbols, were placed with the corpse in the tomb, perhaps as a safeguard against demons.

'The antique cemeteries of Provence supply them yet in great abundance. Gnosticism early took root and flourished in Southern Gaul, as the treatise of Irenæus directed against it attests; and this, it may be, in consequence of the great affinity its original sources bore to the Mithraic and the Druidical systems. Later still, in the middle of the fourth century, a Gnostic sect, the Priscillianists, spread rapidly over the same region. These religionists took their name from their founder, Priscillian, Bishop of Avila, in Spain, who was put to death for heresy by the British Emperor Magnus Maximus. That Spain also had, long before Priscillian's time, received and fostered the Basilidan Creed, though so remote from its fountain head, appears from a passage in Jerome's twenty-ninth letter to Theodora: "Our friend Licinius, when that most foul heresy of Basilides was raging throughout Spain, and, like a plague and pestilence, laying waste all the province between the Pyrenæes and the ocean, held fast the purity of the Church's faith, far from receiving Armagel, Barbelo, Abraxas, Balsamus, the ridiculous Leusiboras, and the other similar monstrosities."

'It is more than probable that such doctrines lurked unnoticed amongst the original natives of Gaul during the reigns of the Arian Gothic kings, and did no more than revive, and again flourish vigorously in the Manicheism of the Albigenses during the twelfth century.'—Pp. 119, 120.

In taking leave of Mr. King, we may thank him for a large mass of information on a very interesting subject. We must, however, warn our readers against the character of his book. It is said that no one can write the history of a sect, but one who is himself a member of it; Mr. King seems to be of this opinion, for certainly he seems a good deal more of a Gnostic, than a Catholic Christian.

The Gnostics seem to have found it very convenient to class themselves with Catholics, and one of their devices was to publish a number of books in imitation of the canonical books, and generally bearing the name of some of the Apostles. The number of these books mentioned by the Fathers of the first four centuries is incredible; and, probably, there is a still larger number not mentioned at all. Even in the times of the Apostles, there must have been many of a very doubtful character. S. Luke, in the Preface to his Gospel, alludes to the fact, or, rather, professes to write his Gospel to counteract these, perhaps mischievous, narratives. 'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand,' &c. Again, S. Paul seems to allude twice to some such writings: in Gal. i. 6, he speaks of 'another Gospel'; in 2 Thess. ii. 2, he warns the Thessalonians against

being shaken in mind 'by letter, as from us;' and he concludes the Epistle with these words: 'The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle: so I write;' evidently to guard against imposition. S. Irenæus expressly says, that in his time, 'The Gnostics had an innumerable multitude of spurious and apocryphal books' (Adv. Her. i. 17). The greater part of these books is lost, only a few have come down to us; of the former, fragments are found in the writings of some of the Fathers; and it is from these that we are able to judge of their character. Of all these the most important is the Gospel of the Nazarenes; it is frequently spoken of by the Fathers under different names, as the Gospel of the Hebrews, of the Ebionites, of the Twelve Apostles, of Bartholomew, of Cerinthus or Merinthus.

As far as we can gather, it was a translation of S. Matthew's Gospel into Hebrew, omitting the first two chapters, consequently commencing with the preaching of S. John the Baptist; that is, the genealogy and birth of our Lord are left out, being, of course, contradictory to Gnostic teaching; besides this, there were interpolations of various kinds. It is most probable that this corruption of S. Matthew was the work of Cerinthus, and was accomplished not long after the publication of the genuine Gospel; for Epiphanius says (Heres. li. 7), that it was on account of this corruption of the true, that S. Luke wrote his Gospel; referring to it in the words, 'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand,' &c. According to it Christ was a mere man until His Baptism; then the Holy Ghost descending upon Him, transformed Him into the Son of God. S. Jerome, who translated this Gospel, has left us several fragments; one is as follows (Com. in Isaiah, xi. 2): 'Besides in that Gospel, just mentioned, we find these things written: It came to pass when the Lord ascended from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Ghost descended and rested upon Him, and said unto Him My Son, among (or during all the time of, *in omnibus prophetis*) all the prophets I was waiting for Thy coming, that I might rest upon Thee; for Thou art My rest; Thou art My First-begotten Son, who shall reign to everlasting ages.' Again, in another place, 'The Holy Ghost, My mother, just now laid hold on Me.' The Hebrew word for Spirit רוח is feminine, therefore called the Mother of Christ. We see in this the regular Gnostic doctrine of emanation and generation of Æons, combined with what they called Incarnation; according to them Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and was no more than an ordinary man till His baptism—that until then he was ignorant that He was to become the Son of God; for, we read, 'Behold the mother and brethren of

'Christ spake to Him, John the Baptist baptizes for the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized by him: He said to them, In what have I sinned, that I have need to go and be baptized by him? Unless my saying this proceeds perhaps from ignorance.' In the 'Preaching of Peter,' we have this saying further explained. That Christ confessed His sins, and was compelled, contrary to His own inclination, by His mother Mary, to submit to the baptism of John. In this Gospel occurs that story of S. James, so often repeated—it will be found in Nelson's 'Fasts and Festivals'—that he solemnly swore, that from the time of his eating of the Last Supper till he saw our Lord risen from the dead, he would neither eat nor drink. A different version of the rending of the veil at the Crucifixion is also recorded by S. Jerome, as found in this Gospel; 'In the Gospel, which I have often mentioned, we read, that a lintel of the Temple of an immense size was broken and rent.' (Comment. S. Matt. xviii.) It is worth while to compare this with a story in the Talmud, told us by Lightfoot. (Exer. upon S. John, ch. x.) 'Forty years before the destruction [of Jerusalem], the gates of the Temple opened themselves of their own accord. Rabban Jochanan ben Zacchai declaimed upon it [objurgavit portas], saying, O Temple, Temple, why dost thou terrify thyself? I know thy end will be destruction; for so Zechariah, the son of Iddo, hath prophesied concerning thee; Open thy doors, O Lebanon,' &c.

Both Irenæus and Epiphanius make mention of a 'Gospel of the Ebionites;' from the extracts left to us, there is some doubt whether this was identical with the last mentioned, or whether it was an independent version of S. Matthew's, corrupted to suit the doctrines of the sect. In it our Lord is born in the ordinary course of nature, and is a great prophet of the Law; the obligation to observe which is one of the most prominent features of their Gospel; our Lord's teaching is there represented as giving a deeper and more spiritual meaning to the Law than appeared on the surface. This accorded with the whole system of the Ebionites, who were really mystics, and eagerly embraced every opportunity to obtain higher doctrine; while at the same time they scrupulously adhered to all the Mosaic observances, partly, as a demotic religion, and partly, as the external vehicle for a hidden and esoteric teaching. Epiphanius (Her. 30, 16) mentions another book of the Ebionites, 'The Acts of the Apostles,' in which the like sentiments are expressed. From his account it appears that S. Paul was especially held in abhorrence, on account of his writings against the observing of the Levitical Law; he is there represented as a Gentile; who having come to Jerusalem, was desirous to



marry the daughter of the High Priest; for which purpose he became a proselyte, and was circumcised. On the refusal of the High Priest to give his daughter to him, he became an open enemy, and wrote against circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Mosaic Law.

Another sect of mystics was that of the Essenes, a branch of which existed in Egypt, and was there known under the name of the Therapeutæ. These last differed widely from the Ebionites, in that they rejected a very large part of the Mosaic Law, viz. all that related to animal sacrifices and the Temple worship, in fact, almost the whole of the external observances, except the Sabbath; on the observance of this last they were excessively strict. They too had a 'Gospel;' it is known as the 'Gospel of the Egyptians.' Like the Ebionites, they gladly received a portion of Christian teaching, and reputed themselves as followers of Christ. We are not informed in what light they regarded the Incarnation, but most probably as a peculiar manifestation of God, perhaps something like the modern Swedenborgians, for we read, 'In it [*i.e.* the Gospel of the 'Egyptians'] many things of this sort are proposed in a hidden 'mysterious manner, as delivered from the mouth of our Saviour, 'that He taught His disciples: That the Father is the same '[τὸν αὐτὸν], the Son is the same, and the Holy Ghost is the 'same.' These Therapeutics lived wholly on fruit and herbs, and would eat no animal food; they abhorred marriage, holding, probably, with many of the Kabbalists, that the sin of the Fall was concupiscence and lust, and that all evil proceeds from the procreation of children. It is clear that the opinions of this sect were very widely diffused in early times, for they are more than once condemned by S. Paul. Thus, the Corinthian converts were troubled by these Gnostic teachers, and the question of marriage was one point on which they wrote to him. Was it lawful to marry? 'Is it good for a man not to touch a woman?' (γυναικὸς ἅπτεσθαι, to have intercourse with one's wife.) Again, S. Paul reproves the dogmatising of the Colossians (ii. 20), 'touch not,' *i.e.* μὴ γυναικὸς ἅψῃ; 'taste not,' *i.e.* flesh meats; 'handle not,' *i.e.* things declared unclean. Still more strongly (1 S. Tim. iv. 1) those who teach such things are said to 'depart from the faith,' to give 'heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons' (δαίμονων); such were the 'forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats.' All this is 'in strict accordance with what is found in the fragments of the 'Gospel of the Egyptians;' for S. Clement (Alex.) records the following as taken from it, 'When Salome asked our Lord, How 'long death should prevail? . . . He answered As long as ye 'women do bring forth children. Hereupon she said, Then I 'have done well in bearing no children, seeing there is no necessity

‘for generation. To which our Lord replied, Feed upon every herb, but that which has bitterness eat not.’ Again, ‘When Salome asked (Christ) When the things should be known, concerning which she enquired? Our Lord answered, When ye shall not need a covering for your nakedness, when two shall become one, the male with the female, neither male nor female.’—(S. Clem. Strom. iii.)

It is most probable that it is to this sect that we may refer the ‘Gospel of Perfection,’ which Epiphanius calls ‘The Perfection of Sorrow;’ making self-mortification the road to true knowledge (Gnosis), which alone brings perfection. The same author also mentions another Gospel, that of Philip, in which the like notion is carried out; in it is related what the soul is to say when it appears before the heavenly Powers, ‘I have known myself, and I have gathered (*συνέλεξα*) myself from all quarters, and have not begot children for the ruler (*ἀρχοντι*, Devil?), but have torn out all his principles (*ρίζας*, roots), and I have gathered (*συνέλεξα*) the scattered limbs, and I know who thou art, for I am from above. And then it (the soul) is let go, but if it be found to have begotten children, it is obliged to go down again, and stay until it can receive and bring back to itself its own children.’—(Epiph. Her. xxvi. sect. 13.)

The above are sufficient to show the manner in which the Gospel was perverted, and the spurious Gospels produced. The craving for knowledge, the desire to satisfy the mind as to the mysteries of the past, and of the future, the study of heathen philosophy, had all combined to induce the contemplative Jew to construct his Gnosis, his mystery; the singularly ascetic life led by the Essenes and Therapeutæ, their doctrine that knowledge was the only perfection, would naturally lead their excited minds into every extravagance. The purer doctrine, the further revelation, taught by our Lord and His Apostles, would naturally attract their attention, while their holy lives would insure their reverence. Especially attractive would be the teaching by parables—the wisdom hidden under outward figures. But there would be parts of the Gospel so utterly contrary to their whole notion of perfection, that they could never submit to become entirely Christian; the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, of the actual Crucifixion of the Incarnate God, the sanctity of marriage, and the non-distinction of meats, would be so entirely repugnant to their principles, that they could never submit to receive implicitly the Catholic truth in its entirety; yet they were not unwilling to pass under the common term of Christians. They wished also for some authority for their peculiar tenets; they consequently gave the name of one or more of the Apostles to their writings. Thus S. Cyril (Cat. vi.),

speaking of the Manichees, declares that Manes received his doctrines from the books of Scythianus, of whom he says, 'There was a certain person in Egypt, named Scythianus, a Saracen by nation, having nothing in common with the Jewish or Christian religion. When he lived at Alexandria, and conformed himself to rules of life in the Aristotlean philosophy, he composed four books; one called the "Gospel," not as containing any account of the actions of Christ, but only taking its title from Him; the second, termed "Of Chief Points" (*κεφαλαίων*); the third, "Of Mysteries;" the fourth, "Of Treasures."' In connexion with this we may mention two of a very blasphemous character; one, 'The Gospel of Eve,' mentioned by Epiphanius (Her. xxvi. 2, 3), called also, 'The Gospel of Perfection'; in which Eve is represented as receiving a perfect Gnosis from her discourse with the serpent. This was, no doubt, a degraded form of Kabbalism, in which the Fall holds a very important place. The other, mentioned by Irenæus (Her. i. 35), 'The Gospel of Judas Iscariot;' apparently the Gospel of the Cainites, a sect which glorified all the evil-doers in the Bible from Cain downwards, including Esau, Korah, and the Sodomites; 'These things, they say, Judas, who betrayed Christ, carefully obtained the knowledge of; and as he was the only one of the Apostles who knew the truth, he accomplished the mystery of betraying Christ. By whom (Judas) they say, all things in heaven and earth were solved [*dissoluta*]; and they produce a forged writing in accordance with their principles, which they call the "Gospel of Judas."'

This custom of affixing the names of the Apostles to these forgeries continued to exist even to the seventh century. We have an instance in the 'Gospel of Barnabas,' the work of some Mohammedan. In it Barnabas professes to be well acquainted with the Blessed Virgin, SS. James and John, and writes, that when she and the disciples were mourning for the supposed death of Christ, the latter appears to them, and declares that He was not crucified, but that Judas suffered in His stead. He concludes by saying, 'And as for my part, although I lived a very blameless life in the world, yet since men call me God, and the Son of God, it pleased God, in order to prevent my being mocked by devils in the Judgment Day, that I should suffer disgrace in this world by the death of Judas, all men being persuaded that I really died on the Cross. Wherefore this reproach shall last till the coming of Mohammed, who, when he shall come into the world, will deliver all those who believe the law of God from this error.' In another part of this Gospel Mohammed is especially named as the 'Paraclete' promised by our Lord.

When speaking of Mohammed we may be allowed to digress

for a moment, to say that he seems to have been entirely ignorant of the writings which compose the Canonical New Testament, though he was well acquainted with those of the Old; but he was acquainted with several of the spurious Gospels. Thus Sura xix. (Rodwell, lviii.) is entitled 'Mary;' and it is taken, as far as regards Mary, from the 'Gospel of Mary,' and the 'Protevangelium of James.' So is much of Sura iii. (Rodwell, xcvi.) In Sura iv. (Rodwell, c.) the crucifixion of Christ is denied, 'one was made to appear to them like' (Him). Again, the story of our Lord speaking in the cradle, and of His making birds out of clay, and giving them life, mentioned in Sura v. (Rodwell, cxiv.) are both taken from the 'Gospel of the Infancy.' In no case are there any such quotations from the Canonical New Testament throughout the whole Koran. On the contrary, Mohammed everywhere supposes Christians to be worshippers of three gods. We have probably said enough on this subject.

There is, however, one piece that we must examine briefly, not for its intrinsic value, but because a modern writer has set it forth as a genuine and authentic writing; we allude to the 'Preaching of Peter,' with its preface, the 'Epistle of Peter to James.' This work is mentioned as early as the second century, by Heracleon, a heretic, who lived about 130 A.D. It is, therefore, of considerable antiquity. Fragments are found in the 'Strom.' &c. of S. Clement, especially Lib. vi. The epistle bears the inscription, 'Peter to James, Lord and Bishop of the Holy Church from the Father of all, through Jesus Christ, in peace everywhere.' The object in writing this epistle professes to be a desire on the part of S. Peter to preserve a record of his teaching; he therefore transmits his 'Preaching' to S. James, with an injunction to keep it secret from the multitude, and only to communicate it to such as could be trusted:—'I earnestly entreat and desire that you would not deliver the "Works of my Preaching," which I have sent you, to any of the Gentiles, nor even to any one of our own country, before he has undergone probation (*πρὸς πείρας*); but if he show himself worthy, then let them be delivered to him, after the same manner as Moses delivered (his teaching) to the seventy men, who were the successors to his seat.' Mr. Ernest de Bunsen ('Hidden Wisdom of Christ,' vol. ii. ch. 8) tries hard to prove that this is an authentic document, and that it is in entire accordance with the practice of the twelve Apostles, excluding SS. Paul and Barnabas. According to him, the Gospel has a Gnosis, which Christ taught secretly to His disciples, and they only to those who had undergone probation (*πείρα*). The Gnosis lay under the Law, the obligation of which is still enforced. S. Peter is represented as saying, 'And these things some have attempted, even while I am alive, perverting the intent of my

'words by various interpretations, even to the extent that the Law should be abrogated, as if that was my opinion, but did not dare to declare it.' Later on in the same century we have the 'Recognition of Clement,' which Cave, with great probability, conjectures to be the work of Bardasanes. These 'Recognitions,' as well as the 'Homilies,' Mr. De Bunsen would have us believe as authentic, if not genuine.

The multiplication of these spurious writings, and the general prevalence of Gnostic doctrines among all classes, Jews as well as heathen, will account for the numberless and strange heresies of the early ages of the Church. It was not till several centuries had passed that the Canon of the New Testament was definitely settled, and certainly not till the Council of Nicea, that the Church was in possession of an authoritative creed; and we may fairly say that not till the sixth General Council was the faith of the Church finally settled. We can well understand, therefore, how frequent would be heresy innocently held in remote quarters, by those who, possessing one or more of these spurious writings, bearing the name of an Apostle, believed them to be authentic. Faustus, the Manichee, appealed to the 'Gospel of the Nativity of Mary' to prove that Christ was not the Son of God until His Baptism; also, that He was not of the Tribe of Judah, because, in that book the Blessed Virgin is said to be of the Tribe of Levi. It was from the same source that the Collyridians established their custom of making offerings to the Virgin, because it was there said either that she was born of a virgin, or, at least, conceived without sin. It is not unlikely that these last supposed her to be an incarnation of the Spirit of God, which is in Hebrew feminine; and, as we before mentioned, in the Gospel of the Nazarenes, Christ speaks of 'The Holy Ghost, my Mother.' It was, doubtless, from this Gospel that Mohammed framed his tradition, that though all new-born children are touched by Satan, the Blessed Virgin and Christ were excepted from his influence (Rodwell's Koran, Sura xevii. p. 499, note).

It is right to say, that the Manichean Gospel, used by those heretics was not the same as either of those now extant under the same names.<sup>1</sup>

The student of ecclesiastical history will hardly be surprised at seeing a revival of ancient heresies in his own day; the tendency of the human mind is to run in a certain groove, when brought under certain like circumstances, and to speculate in a like manner, when under similar influences. An age of great

<sup>1</sup> We may relegate to a note a brief notice of the still extant writings that go under the incongruous name of the 'Apocryphal New Testament.' They are not all heretical, nor the production of heretics, though some are full of very childish stories. They will be found in 'Jones on the Canon,' and in a separate collection published in 1820, by William Hone, who has borrowed, without acknowledg-

intellectual activity will be naturally inclined to the making of knowledge the principal part of religion, and inquirers will never be content till they have constructed a 'scheme of redemption' according to each one's idiosyncrasy. Taking the Holy Scriptures as their text-book, they will fix upon one doctrine as the great prevailing idea of the whole, and compel all other doctrines to subserve it. Luther did this with his 'Justification by Faith Alone,' Calvin with his scheme of Predestination, Quakers, Swedenborgians, and numberless small sects, continue to follow their example. They each have their 'Gnosis,' which is their all in all. The modern tendency of Protestantism to make preaching the one great ministerial function, all fosters the Gnostic spirit, and naturally culminates in heresy and fanaticism. Still more recent, and more plainly Gnostic, is the idea, prominently advanced, that the Holy Scriptures only *contain* the Word of God, which man is to search for under the letter, a thing to be revealed by his own consciousness, and of which he alone is the judge. To this, and to all other forms of Gnosticism, there is only one antidote, the accepting implicitly the decision and universal faith of the Catholic Church; one safeguard, in seeking salvation rather through the gifts of the Spirit in the Sacraments and worship of the Church, than in the acquisition of knowledge. 'Knowledge puffeth up, charity edifieth.' The gifts of grace are higher than those of knowledge; the 'spiritual man' need not be a man of vast knowledge, but he must be one to whom God has imparted His grace.

ment, nearly the whole from Jones, adding 'Archbishop Wake's Translation of the Apostolic Fathers,' &c. and a not very wise or accurate preface of his own. In 1863 we were startled by the apparition of a book with the following portentous title-page, bristling with capitals: 'The Suppressed Gospels and Epistles of the Original New Testament of Jesus Christ, and other portions of the Ancient Holy Scriptures, now extant, attributed to His Apostles and their Disciples, and venerated by the Primitive Christian Churches during the first four centuries; but since, after violent disputations, forbidden by the Bishops of the Nicene Council, in the reign of the Emperor Constantine, and omitted from the Catholic and Protestant Editions of the New Testament by its Compilers. Translated from the Original Tongue, with Historical References to their Authenticity, by Archbishop Wake, and other learned divines. London: E. Handcock and Co. 1863.' This magnificent title-page is followed by a mere reprint of Hone's book, correcting a few, not all, of Hone's clerical errors. Deceived by Hone's very foolish preface, and profoundly ignorant of the difference between spurious Gospels and the genuine writings of the Apostolic Fathers, he tells us that the epistles of St. Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius, were 'forbidden by the Bishops of the Nicene Council!!' This learned editor is, we are informed, a preacher. Some of these pieces were well known to, and much used by, the monkish writers of the Middle Ages; by them these histories were made the subjects of some of the 'Miracle plays,' once so popular; of which the 'Gospel of Mary,' of the 'Infancy,' and that of 'Nicodemus,' were perhaps the most common. Mr. Hone informs us that Wynkyn de Worde printed an edition of the latter in 1509; and that a MS. copy of the 'Infancy' is yet extant in Welsh.



Art. IX.—*Christendom's Divisions, being a Philosophical Sketch of the Divisions of the Christian Family in East and West.*  
By EDMUND S. FFOULKES, formerly Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford. London: Longmans & Co. 1865.

VERY distinguished historians of our time, Dr. Arnold, Sir Francis Palgrave, Augustin Thierry, have freely expressed their opinions on the merits and demerits of the practice of writing accounts of the past which are intended to have some special influence upon our views of the present. Thierry, on the whole, condemns the habit; the two Englishmen sum up strongly in its favour. Arnold sees, in the presence or absence of this element, the point of difference between the mere antiquary and the real historian. He inquires, whether it be possible for any one to comprehend the parties of other days, if he has no clear notion of those of his own. He asserts that the man who feels keenly about his own age, will derive an advantage from that interest which is sufficient to outweigh even the defects arising from insufficiency of knowledge and from strength of prejudice. He points to the well-known instance of Mitford, and maintains that that writer's partialities, however injurious to his fairness, have at any rate completely saved his well-known 'History of Greece' from being dull. 'Mitford took an interest in the parties of Greece because he was alive to the parties of his own time: he described the popular party in Athens just as he would have described the Whigs of England; he was unjust to Demosthenes, because he would have been unjust to Mr. Fox. His knowledge of the Greek language was limited, and so was his learning altogether; but because he was an English gentleman who felt and understood the state of things around him, and entered warmly into its parties, therefore he was able to write a history of Greece, which has the great charm of reality; and which, if I may judge by my own experience, is read at first with interest and retains its hold firmly on the memory.'<sup>1</sup> Very similar is the language of Sir F. Palgrave. He too maintains that such a sentiment as even party spirit will at least supply an additional motive to whet the zeal of the narrator. 'No writer can narrate impressively, unless he feels forcibly; and there is no influence which will impel any one who really deserves the name of an historian so energetically as the earnest desire of

<sup>1</sup> Arnold's Lectures on Modern History. Pp. 85, 86.

'propagating opinions which he believes it to be his duty to 'teach or proclaim.' To Thierry's objections, Sir Francis replied with a *tu quoque*. 'If there be any guilt in such a party course, no culprit is more brilliant and successful than he.'<sup>1</sup> Certainly this mode of treating the history of the past is not likely to fall out of fashion in France. M. Berryer, and other eminent Frenchmen, have composed papers on the decline of Rome, which were eagerly hailed in the *Faubourg St. Germain* as a brilliant attack upon the existing institutions of the country. They are now met in their own way; an exalted personage gives us a biography of Julius Cæsar, in which we are evidently called upon to recognise a prototype of the First Napoleon in Julius, and seemingly, too, a precursor of the third Napoleon in Augustus.

But we must not remain blind to the real perils which beset this species of composition. In the first place, both writers and their critics lie in danger of forcing their parallels unduly. Arnold, in a passage just cited, names in one breath Demosthenes and Charles James Fox, The *Anti-Jacobin*, when this same comparison was made, indignantly demanded—

'Who now in this presumptuous hour,  
Aspires to share the Athenian's praise?  
The advocate of foreign power,  
The *Eschines* of later days.'

It would not be difficult for an impartial judge to point out the many features in which Fox's position is utterly different from that of either of the great rival orators. This, then, is one danger; lest our keen interest in the present should induce us to deliver an unjust verdict on the conduct of men of other days, because perhaps in some salient points they may resemble modern characters with whom we have either too much or too little sympathy. Such a tendency may involve an historian in a multitude of minor errors as regards the interpretation of the past. Nor is his application of the lessons of those vanished ages to the changed circumstances of the present time less perilous. For, supposing it proved that a certain line of policy was ever so admirably adapted to a given time and country, it does not follow that it is the panacea for the evils of another land, in another age. He who grants most unreservedly that the union of powers in the person of Octavian, was on the whole beneficial to Rome and to the nations under her sway, is by no means necessarily committed thereby to the assertion, that Imperialism is the *régime* which is best suited to modern France. Few writers have rated more highly than did Sismondi, the benefits which

<sup>1</sup> Palgrave's History of Normandy and England. Vol. i. pp. 264—266.

the feudal system conferred on Europe; but he would have been the last to wish for its revival, when its work was done:—

‘The old order changeth, yielding place to new,  
And God fulfils himself in many ways,  
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.’

It must be a great satisfaction to any thoughtful and earnest man, who is attempting to treat a large and complex subject of historic investigation, to feel that he is thoroughly secured from the intrusion of at least one danger. Men will long continue to differ respecting the wisdom of the annalist who is trying to inspire them with attachment to a particular system of government, or of social arrangement, or even of one particular form of Christianity. But it is hardly possible that any, save a few very peculiarly-constituted minds, can dissent from the object of one who traces the history of divisions in the past, in order that he may achieve what lies in his power towards the healing of those dissensions in the future. In whatever degree these mighty rents and schisms in Christendom may have been over-ruled to good, this does not render them good in themselves, any more than the fall of our first parents was good because of the reparation made through Christ. The political philosopher can point to no charter that assures him of a certainty of advantage to mankind as the result to which his lucubrations tend. But the divine whose writings aim at the reproduction of unity, turns to the words which Jesus uttered immediately before He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron. ‘Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We are. . . . Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their words; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. . . . That they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one.’ One of these efforts, a prelude to still further efforts having the same tendency, is now lying before us in the book named at the head of this article. We propose firstly to give our readers a brief epitome of Mr. Ffoulkes’s volume, and then to criticise the views propounded by him.

Mr. Ffoulkes informs us in his preface, that the idea of the present volume was suggested to his mind by a book which proceeded, some forty years since, from the pen of a priest of the French Oratory, M. Tabaraud. But the work referred to did not look back beyond the date of the Reforma-

tion, and our author thought that a larger survey was requisite. To be engaged in constantly discussing difficult problems, such as the Infallibility of the Church, and the Apostolical Succession, while certain plain commands of brotherly love are little practised and thought of, seemed like attempts to accomplish feats of scholarship without having mastered the first rules of parsing and construing. And again, as to place means before ends is bad philosophy, so too to quarrel about sacraments and the hierarchy appears like a sacrifice of the integrity of the end to the means, and moreover to bring discredit upon the sacred subjects thus discussed, because they naturally come to be regarded as special causes of disunion. Appeal is then made to Englishmen, as members of a nation having a special affection for the monarchical form of government. But it is not to be supposed that this appeal is a plea for Rome; no, it is a plea for Christianity. The great danger impending over the civilized world, if it cease to acknowledge Christianity as its rule of life, is pointed out, and the tendency of our divisions to bring about such a calamity is forcibly insisted on.

Such is the tenor of our author's preface. He then commences his work with some remarks on the points of contrast and of similarity between history secular and history ecclesiastical, and enlarges on the signs requisite to form continuity, insisting much upon their presence in Jewish and in Christian Church-history, which is to be regarded as one great whole. Great stress is laid upon the value of synods and councils as the highest known modes of attaining to decisions on controverted questions, and the natural growth of a system of metropolitans and patriarchs is traced. The importance of the results arising from the intervention of the emperors is fully recognised. The position gained at an early period by Rome is discussed with much fairness, without any inclination on our author's part to ignore the influence of either the terrestrial or the spiritual element. From the consideration of both is drawn an argument in favour, *ideally*, of a vast democratic government for the Church, but *practically* in favour of that shape which was actually adopted by the hierarchy; and Hallam, M. Guizot, and Dean Milman, are cited in favour of the latter part of this conclusion. A very interesting sketch on the causes of the rupture between East and West is then given us; the sinful lives of bishops of each great see being first dwelt upon, then the growth of the Roman temporalities, and thirdly the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed.

Several sections are then devoted to a consideration of the several characteristics of different theologians and schools of theology. Great saints and doctors, such as Athanasius, August-

tine, John Damascene, are commented upon; as also the famous schoolmen, Peter Lombard and Aquinas; a glowing eulogy being passed upon the *Summa Theologiæ*, as not only revealing a world of thought, into which Greek theology had never entered, but as being likewise a source of inspiration to Dante, Giotto, and Michael Angelo. A curious inquiry into the relation between Eastern and Western heresies occupies several succeeding sections.

Mr. Ffoulkes then conducts us to the consideration of that portion of the divine science which he proposes to specify by the title of Anthropology. Herein he maintains that the Mediæval Church achieved a great work in so far as regards its objective part, but failed to grapple with the subjective, until the need to face this latter problem was imperatively demanded through the rise of Luther and Lutheranism. In proof that the decisions of the Council of Trent in this matter have received commendation from other than Roman Catholics, appeal is made to the well-known eulogy bestowed by Hallam, in his 'Literature of Europe.' Mr. Ffoulkes proceeds to argue that, from the premisses he has even in this portion of his work obtained, he may fairly infer the truth of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Some sections on Mahommedanism follow. They will be found, in the main, accordant with an article which appeared in the *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1855: an article which Mr. Ffoulkes has done us the honour to refer to and to quote from. This is followed by an attempt at comparison between the position of Luther and Mohammed.

We are then presented with a sketch of the practical corruptions of the Church in the age immediately preceding the Reformation. The following passage is both striking in itself, and affords a good specimen of the compressed power of this most able and interesting little volume:—

'How, then, did it happen that the remedy was not applied more promptly and more effectually to the disease? Because there is always, in every society, and not by any means exclusively in the Church, a party that is interested and bent upon keeping things as they are, be they ever so reprehensible, and opposed to making any change, be it ever so beneficial. No system—not even the Church, not even the Cloister—can go on for long without requiring to be recast, reformed, or modified according to its altered circumstances. The business is, what alterations are to be made, and who is to make them? Happy those institutions that can or will reform themselves, or, in the opposite case, can be compelled to do so by constituted authority from without—in the way in which our universities, our public schools, our various corporate bodies in England have been of late years, by dint of pressure through the Crown! From the nature of the case, the universal Church can only be reformed from within, now that there is no universal empire; and when one part of it is both willing and anxious to be reformed, another part of it may

step in and deprecate and prevent change of any kind. From the very nature of the case, too, the argument against change is stronger in the Church than elsewhere; not merely because some of its institutions and all its articles of faith assume to be from God, but because, in most cases, its worst abuses are found entwined about its holiest rites. In the Church, as elsewhere, reformers have their persecutions to go through, and all real successes are achieved by patience and perseverance—not revolt. It is so no less in the Cloister. S. Benedict had his life attempted by the monks of Vicovara, who had elected him for their abbot; Savonarola was burnt in the city where he had for so many years preached Christ crucified. The reforms of S. Teresa involved her in undying enmity from one branch of the Carmelites; S. Philip Neri, the Apostle of Rome, as he is justly styled, was threatened with imprisonment by the papal vicar of that city, “if he did not leave his new ways of proceeding.” He it was above all others who had been advocating the practice of frequent communions. The sternest and most zealous of the reforming popes experienced no better treatment at the hands of their degenerate subjects. Adrian VI. was thought to have died through the wilfulness of his own physician. On the news of his death the house of Macerata was decorated with garlands, and with this vile inscription, “*Liberatori urbis et orbis.*” Buried in the very church of S. Peter, between Pius II. and III., his tomb was lampooned, in large letters, “*Impius inter pios.*” All Raynaldus can hear of him is, that his character was irreproachable, and that his election was reported to have been by Divine choice. Paul IV. who, “lived and moved in his reforms and his inquisition,” as Ranke says of him, was an object of malediction through life, and at his death his statue was thrown down and broken in pieces by the infuriated mob.—Pp. 128—130.

The next twenty pages of the work are replete with facts of a similar nature, in many cases of a curious and (to us, at least) novel character. Having cited a passage of the above tenor, we think it to be due to fairness to quote some words of comment upon the bold and uncompromising language addressed by Cardinal Contarini to Paul III.—

‘I much question whether Tribonian ever ventured to be as explicit with Justinian; or Cecil, Clarendon, or Sunderland with the houses of Tudor or Stuart, acting on the received principle that kings reigned by divine right, and could do no wrong. Can any correspondence like this be produced between Colbert and the Grand Monarque? Whatever may be the faults of the clergy, as a body of men, in all ages, I know of no other profession in which manly avowals like these have been as common, or in which good men have struggled harder against difficulties, not always of their own making, for the sake of improving society, or with less heed of their own vested interests.’—P. 151.

Attention is next called to the names of certain Continental bishops who became Protestants; as Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, and Paul Vergerius, Bishop of Capo d’Istria, besides numbers in England, Norway, Hungary, Silesia, and Transylvania. An account of the Council of Trent and its transactions is accompanied by a natural expression of regret that no authentic copy of the ‘Acts’ of that Council has been published. A striking and very candid sketch of the sufferings inflicted by each side on their opponents, by war and by persecution, is then



drawn:—‘Seldom has more suffering been entailed upon humanity than in the wars of the Huguenots in France, the ‘Thirty Years’ War in Germany, the campaigns of Alva and of ‘Don John in the Netherlands, and the Rebellions of A.D. 1642-‘60, and even of 1688, in Great Britain and Ireland; and each ‘one of these had a religious bearing and character’ (P. 169). Our author argues, from the history of the period, ‘that it would ‘seem as though the Sovereign Judge of all men was alternately ‘displeased with both sides, and almost in the same degree’ (*Ibid*).

Candid endeavours to measure the practical corruptions of the Gallican Church under the Regency of Orleans, and a proclamation of the excellent lives led, and the excellent works achieved, by the post-Reformation popes, and a powerful defence of the Jesuits—of which more presently—occupy several pages. Then follows a generous estimate of the labours undertaken by members of the Reformed communions, in the departments of exegesis, of patristic lore, of ecclesiastical history, and of the inductive sciences, and a full recognition of the remarkable victory over Deism won by the Anglican divines of the eighteenth century. At this point is interposed a brief discussion favourable to the validity of Anglican orders. But the thirty pages beginning at p. 199 contain an ably-written, though somewhat severe attack upon the Prayer-book and the Thirty-nine Articles. To this attack we may recur presently; in the mean time let us call attention to the following admission of Urban VIII. to Cardinal Borgia; which, though it has been cited elsewhere, is new to us, and will probably be new to most of our readers:—

‘We know that we may declare Protestants excommunicate, as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth, and before him Clement VII. the King of England—Henry VIII., but with what success? *The whole world can tell: we yet bewail it in tears of blood.* Wisdom doth not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement VII.’—P. 230.

Admissions of a somewhat similar character, respecting the utter mismanagement of the Roman Catholic cause by its supporters in the reign of James II. are extracted by our author from the correspondence of Father Conn. The remainder of the work is occupied by some just and often eloquently-expressed reflections upon the excellencies of Christianity, and the possibilities of future union.

From what has been said, it may be gathered that Mr. Ffoulkes has produced no common book. It is, indeed, a work which displays large and varied reading, great power of compression, vigour of style, and the most earnest endeavour to be fair. And just because we can sympathise with it to so consi-

derable an extent, and feel much gratitude towards its author, we are the more bound to indicate some of the points on which its reasonings have failed to convince us. We may specify two very wide questions—those of (1) Monarchy, and (2) the Reformation; two very subordinate ones—(3) Mohammed, and (4) the Jesuits. On each of these we would fain say something, and then, with all kindly sentiments, leave the book to the judgment of others.

1. Mr. Ffoulkes is fond, perhaps almost over-fond, of analogies. In the eleventh page of his preface, he appeals to the British Monarchy, and would argue thence to the constitution of the Church. But then it must be remembered how very exceptional is the form which government has assumed in this country. It cannot in strictness be said to *flourish* on the soil of any other great nation. Political writers—Mr. Grote, the late Mr. Hallam, and others,—evidently regard it as a phenomenon which is liable to be suddenly uprooted and overthrown: from above, if there arise an able, resolute, and aggressive monarch; from below, if the many should grow tired of witnessing the semblance, without the reality of originaive and responsible authority. And then, again, side by side with the growth of the United States and the British Colonies (the one avowedly a democracy, the other virtually such) we have the prophetic voices of a De Tocqueville, of a Carlyle, &c. warning us to look for the triumph of democratic government over the whole earth. Mr. Lowe, indeed, avows his disbelief in these prognostications, and his judgment may, after all, be right. In any case there may be ample and sufficient grounds of other kinds on which to build a vindication of some species of monarchical government as a necessity for the Church. But it is hardly, we conceive, an age in which it is safe or wise to make use of even an *argumentum ad hominem* (or we might say *ad gentem*) in favour of a limited monarchy in the Church, from the fact of its success in the State. At the present moment, even Mr. Henley is drawing most unfavourable comparisons between the nobleness exhibited by both sides in the American contest, and the shamelessness displayed towards Denmark by monarchical Austria and Prussia.

Yet, further, if this first point were conceded, this is not an age in which men can argue from the presence of a *rex regum* as affording a presumption in favour of an *Episcopus Episcoporum*. So long as the Roman Emperors had sway, or while, subsequently, the German emperors claimed to represent them, such an analogy might be pressed with much plausibility, but it has long ceased to have any weight. Indeed, the presumption, so far as it is worth anything, would now seem to lie in an opposite direction.

2. The Reformation presents a thousand aspects to observers who stand at different points of the compass. There is the Lutheran point of view, the Calvinistic, and that of the sceptics. There is the Roman estimate, which is very different among Ultramontanes, Gallicans, and Germans. There is the Anglican, which is also of necessity at least twofold or threefold in its character. Of the judgment of the Continental Protestant communions we shall not speak, but it is necessary to say something concerning the others.

Voltaire may be accepted as the representative of scepticism. He speaks as follows:—‘When they had given the Dominicans ‘that farm in Germany, the Augustinians, who had long been ‘in possession were jealous, and those petty interests of monks ‘in a corner of Saxony produced more than a hundred years of ‘disorders, of madness, and of misfortunes among thirty nations. ‘You are not ignorant that this great revolution in the human ‘mind, and in the political system of Europe, was begun by ‘Martin Luther, who was charged by his superiors with the ‘office of preaching against the merchandise which they had not ‘been able to sell.’<sup>1</sup> On this explanation let it here suffice to remark, that it is (to say the very least) most miserably inadequate. Jealousies between religious orders were by no means a novelty in Christendom. They had occurred before, just as they have occurred since. How is it that, in Luther’s time, and then only, they evoked the wide-spread, pervasive, and enduring effects of the Reformation? To this query the words of Voltaire do not so much as even suggest a reply.

We turn to the Ultramontane view. Spain and Italy allow the existence of abuses in practice, and the need of a protest against them, but they regard the movement in all other respects as being simply a wicked revolt against lawful authority. That a Balmes, or a Perrone, should hold such language as this does not astonish us; but we own to some surprise, and no small degree of regret, when we find the liberal monk of Monte-Cassino, Don Luigi Tosti, indulging in this strain.<sup>2</sup>

The Gallican tone is, as might be expected, more moderate, and seems to stand midway between Italian and the German judgment. Bossuet, while calling attention, as Voltaire afterwards did, to the rivalry between the Augustin and Jacobin fraternities, adds:—‘Who knows not that Luther, chosen to ‘maintain the honours of his order, attacked, in the first place,

<sup>1</sup> Cited by M. Chas. de Remusat, in the *Revue des deux Mondes* for 15th June, 1854 (p. 1157).

<sup>2</sup> In his *Prolegomeni alla Storia Universale della Chiesa*. Firenze, 1861. See *il contrario*, for an Anglican estimate, the candid and discriminating remarks in the Preface to Bp. Browne’s work on the Articles.

'the abuses which many made of indulgences, and the excesses which they preached concerning them.'<sup>1</sup> Here something more than mere practical abuses are admitted.

There are Germans as Ultramontane in sentiment as Spaniards or Italians. But not such is the tone of Möhler, or of his follower Mr. Ffoulkes. Möhler, in the preface to the first edition of his Symbolism, avowed: 'that the contest sprang out of 'the most earnest endeavours of both parties to uphold the 'truth, the pure and genuine Christianity, in all its integrity.'<sup>2</sup> It may seem unreasonable for us to ask for more than this. But the line of thought adopted by our author towards the close of his work compels us to ask a few questions in connexion with these generous admissions.

Our queries are connected with three words: credulity, superstition, terrorism. Was there credulity in the pre-reformation Church? We answer, that when one of the ablest of modern French apologists, M. Nicolas, comes to the subject of miracles, he is compelled to begin by admitting the difficulty thrown in his way through the excessive credulity of the Mediæval Church. The Christians of those centuries constantly accepted as genuine miracles, either operations of nature, or accounts of deeds which would be truly miraculous if they had happened, but which were wholly unwarranted by evidence. 'Why may not the 'early Christians,' asks the modern sceptic, 'have been similarly 'deceived?' Answers, and those just ones, are no doubt at hand. But at present we only call attention to the fact. Few men of our time in any communion would lend credence to the tale of Saint Fin Barre speaking before his birth; or to the pet sheep of S. Serf, which bleated from inside the stomach of the man, who stole and ate him; and who, when taxed with the theft by the saintly bishop, had denied it. Now we hope that we are not unreasonable; but we desiderate in M. Ffoulkes's book some admissions of this credulity; because we think that they affect our estimate of the Reformation, and consequently our views respecting the grounds of union.

Credulity is not faith. On the contrary it is obnoxious to true faith. When Henry Martyn spoke to the Persians concerning the Divine Master who had confirmed the reality of His mission by the performance of miracles and most specially by calling back three persons from death; they replied with scorn, 'Is that all? Why we had a sage who raised a hundred from the dead.' Here, as so often elsewhere, a fatal readiness to believe militated against the true belief.

<sup>1</sup> Cit. by M. de Remusat, *ubi supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Ffoulkes, p. 121, note 220.

Again, was superstition a reality in those centuries? We assert that credulity necessitates it. Roman Catholics can perceive the existence of superstition elsewhere perhaps with only too much keenness. Witness every Roman account of Oriental Christianity, *e.g.* the very severe (we hope the too severe) one in Dr. Döllinger's 'The Church and the Churches.' But in the same work we find the following words. (The justice of the greater part of them, possibly of the whole, is admitted by Mr. Ffoulkes, but we do not see in his volume any *explicit* assertion similar to that which we shall here italicise.)

'We must admit that the anxiety of the German nation to see the intolerable abuses and scandals in the Church removed was fully justified; and that it sprang from the better qualities of our people, and from their moral indignation at the desecration and corruption of holy things, which were degraded to selfish and hypocritical purposes. We do not refuse to admit that the great separation, and the storms and sufferings connected with it, were an awful judgment upon Catholic Christendom, which clergy and laity had but too well deserved—a judgment which has had an improving and salutary effect. The great intellectual conflict has purified the European atmosphere, has impelled the human mind on to new courses, and has promoted a rich, scientific, and literary life. . . .

'We have also to acknowledge that in the Church the *rust of abuses, and of a mechanical superstition is always forming afresh*; that the servants of the Church sometimes, through insolence and incapacity, and the people through ignorance, brutify the spiritual in religion, and so degrade and deform and misemploy it to their own injury. The right reforming spirit must therefore never depart from the Church, but on the contrary, must periodically break out with renovating strength, and penetrate the conscience and the will of the clergy.'—Pp. 17, 18.

Now the reforming spirit cannot exist without reformers, and reformers need allowance no less than ultra-conservatives. They will be apt to break with the past too much; as their opponents cling to it too exigently. And this consideration tends to palliate much in our position as Anglicans.

Thirdly, if terrorism was rife; if the Reformation *ultimately* (though by no means immediately) led men to toleration; this, too, is surely a great gain. Once more, we appeal to Roman Catholics, lest our feelings should be supposed to arise from a merely insular prejudice. We appeal to the noble speech of M. de Montalembert at the Mechlin Congress: we appeal to the paper in Dr. Newman's last volume of Lectures, entitled 'A Form of Infidelity of the Day.'

Concerning Mohammed it seems almost rude to express any dissent from one who has referred in so flattering a manner to the estimate of the Arab published some ten years since in this *Review*. But, as on the one hand we are unable to follow Mr. Forster in his attempted parallel between Mohammedanism and Romanism, even so too are we unable, on the other hand, to

make much of the analogy which Mr. Ffoulkes would fain establish between Mohammed and Luther.

The Jesuits—what shall we say concerning them? We agree with a contemporary in applying to that marvellous body, the maxim *Ubi benè nemo melius; ubi malè nemo pejus*. The following occur to us as sources of information upon either side.

*Faciunt à Jesuitis.*

Sir J. Stephen's Founders of Jesuitism. (Essays in Eccl. Biog.)

Hallam's General Account of their Achievements.

Mr. Borrow's Bible in Spain.

Their heroic missionary toils and profound triumphs in thought and learning.

Cesare Balbo's *Storia d'Italia*.

Mr. Ffoulkes's own testimony.

Sismondi, who (though an ultra-Protestant) invariably, in his '*Histoire de France*,' defends them as a calumniated body.

The testimony of Joubert and many other distinguished pupils.

The calumnies of Eugene Sue: the dread and hatred displayed by the world.

*Faciunt contra Jesuitas.*

The writings of Pascal and the Port-Royalists.

The Memoirs of the Duc de Saint-Simon.

The dread entertained by many pious persons even among Roman Catholics, including kings and popes. Parts of their conduct in China.

Here we are compelled to pause. It will be seen that we are not yet prepared to accept what we understand to be our author's proposal: namely, that Rome should acknowledge how wrong she was not to summon far sooner a Council to meet Luther's difficulties; and that the Reformed communions should confess themselves in the wrong upon every point of doctrine wherein they differ from Rome. But we repeat that we are very thankful for this volume, and believe that it is calculated to effect great good. Projects for union must first be ventilated by individuals. We gladly listen to Mr Ffoulkes's own: we shall welcome the history of attempts at re-union which he is about to give us. And when we think over the many topics discussed by him here which our limits have compelled us to pass over in silence, we believe that if any of our readers are induced by our criticism to read the volume we have now reviewed, they will find that our account of it has rather understated than exaggerated its merits.



## NOTICES.

RECENT circumstances have brought the subject of Confession very prominently before the public. If what is known by the public, which is too often confounded by the writers in penny newspapers with the readers of penny newspapers were accessible to argument, and to that best sort of argument which is based on facts, we should recommend them to read, which they will not do, Mr. T. T. Carter's treatise on 'The Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England' (Masters). This is a little volume full in substance and moderate in tone. It quite exhausts the literature of the subject, and exhibits much reading and research.—Mr. Badeley has also published a pamphlet on the purely legal aspect of the subject, which we are bound to say that the Law Lords, who in anticipation—and it was an anticipation made in very bad taste and feeling—of Mr. Wagner's case, delivered themselves of certain extra-judicial utterances, might do well to consider.

It will, perhaps, be remembered that Sir Roundell Palmer, in his recent publication on Hymnology, the 'Book of Praise,' called especial notice to the collection of Hymns made by Mr. Sedgwick, of Bishopsgate, and spoke in high terms of that gentleman's remarkable knowledge of the subject. It seems that Mr. Sedgwick has taken the Attorney-General's hint, and he is now engaged in the publication of a 'Library of Spiritual Songs,' comprising the chief English hymn writers of the last two centuries. Their value is rather literary than anything else, for the writers are mostly Calvinists. Here and there a gem may be scratched out from a plentiful surrounding of rubbish. We have before us Miss Taylor's 'Hymns on the Atonement,' which are not of great merit. The publication, however, deserves encouragement chiefly because it gives the authentic text of a set of writers whose works form a chapter, curious and, in some respects, important in ecclesiastical history.

'Post-Medieval Preachers,' by S. Baring-Gould (Rivingtons), comprises not only outlines of sermons by preachers whose names we own are utterly unknown to us, but a very good essay on preaching, and on the defects of modern sermons. We esteem the literary and bibliographical portion of the volume, that is, Mr. Baring-Gould's own labours, far more highly than the specimens. They are, we fear, dull and flat enough; but the introduction is excellent, well written, full of information, and in an excellent tone and spirit.

Dr. Colenso and the writers of his school find it convenient to forget, or at least to conceal their knowledge, that the German writers whose exegesis of the Old Testament they follow, and often follow implicitly, have been controverted on their own ground. One of the many advantages of 'Clark's Theological Library' is to bring out for the information of

English students—a small body—this fact. We are reminded of it by the publication of the last volume of 'Keil and Delitzsch on the Pentateuch' (Clark: Edinburgh), a book suitable for these times. These writers say, and with truth, 'The strength of the opposition to the Unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, arises much less from the peculiarities of form, which the critics place in the foreground, than from the offence which they take at the contents of the books of Moses, which are irreconcilable with the naturalism of the modern views of the world.' We recommend this publication very heartily.—Hengstenberg's 'Commentary on S. John' has also been commenced.

'Symbols of Christ' (Jackson and Walford) is a set of sermons by a dissenting teacher, Mr. Stanford, which we mention, not because we much admire their turgid style, but because they show a little more reading than is usual in dissenting pulpits. But where did Mr. Stanford get the fact that 'sixty thousand men fell at Waterloo?' and where did he get this odd version of Goldsmith's familiar lines on Burke:—

'..... He narrowed his mind,  
And gave to a party what he meant for mankind.'

A little literature goes a long way with dissenting congregations, but that little may as well be correct.

A full and complete Monograph on 'German Rationalism: its Rise, Progress, and Decline' (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh), was published some years by Professor Hagenbach, whose 'History of Doctrine' is perhaps familiar to us. We have now a translation, through Messrs. Clark's prolific press, of his important work. It is chiefly historical and literary, but its value at the present moment is considerable, when so much cold cabbage, the scraps and relics of a Teutonic feast of cavillers, is served up to the simple British reader.

It is unfair to a writer so full of matter and thought as Dr. Irons to dismiss his very able book, 'The Bible and its Interpreters' (Hayes) in a short paragraph. But we may have, or take, occasion to refer to it more fully. Meantime we may state that it deals very fully with all the popular views on the *mode* of revelation, and on the connexion of Scripture. The Bible has come to be treated in a certain way, or rather in many certain, and some uncertain, ways. The popular Protestant thinks that he has got the Bible, but he has not got the Bible, and he does not know what the Bible is. The Roman Catholic knows that he has got the Bible, but what the Bible is is settled for him by a purely arbitrary and questionable authority. The critical school takes the Bible and extracts from it what suits 'the verifying faculty' which is identical with his own taste: and, in fact, every man is his own Scripture-maker. Dr. Irons brings out these points with amazing force and clearness. And he then sets before himself the task of showing that there is a more excellent way. This way is to accept the co-ordinate facts of the Bible and the Church as instruments or Revelation. It is not a fair criticism on Dr. Irons to say that he is more happy in what destroys than in what he builds up. The only objection to

his conclusion is, that the supernatural as such is an impossibility and a delusion. To this objection, and it is as well that everybody should see this, Dr. Irons does not profess to reply. But we should be glad that all advanced critics would fairly acknowledge that in the long run they must be driven to this issue.

Mr. Churchill Babington's 'Introductory Lecture on Archaeology (Deighton and Bell) as Disney Professor in the University of Cambridge, not only maintains but enhances the writer's reputation. As a general guide to the subject it stands alone in our literature: and we are glad to find that, though skilled in mediæval art, Mr. Babington recognises and appeals to the paramount authority of the Greek spirit.

Mr. Gerald Moultrie's 'Poem on the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp' (Masters) is pretty and very prettily printed. We question whether it would not have been as well to omit the humorous passages. As a matter of fact we doubt whether the fierce persecutors of Smyrna were likely to

'Take the Bishop by the arm,  
And pity him in accents warm  
For his mistake;  
And talk in gentlemanly style,  
With half-concealed sarcastic smile,  
Of cage and stake.'

Mr. Christopher Nevile has proved his consistency by a very practical commentary on his principles. He has resigned his living; and therefore he is free enough to say what he pleases about the Church of England. In his 'Letter to Samuel Morley, Esq.—Religion and Politics' (Miall) he produces some odd proofs of the failure of the Church of England. He is credibly informed by 'two tenant farmers in Nottinghamshire, that they 'could not find within ten miles of their residence a single farmer, labourer, 'or servant, who believed the special doctrines of the Prayer-book.' All the farmers, all the labourers, and all the servants, within a tract of country even in Nottinghamshire, of thirty miles round, is a large range of territory. Do the two farmers mean to assure us that they really did complete this investigation? If so, will they tell us how many persons they examined? And what were 'the special doctrines' on which they catechized whole parishes? We are told that 'Lord Ebury has their letters.' They cannot be in more appropriate keeping. His Lordship argues that the Prayer-book ought to be altered because his little boys went to sleep in Church on Good Friday; and he is quite the man to say that the Church of England is a failure because two intelligent farmers cannot find a single Hodge who can give a good account of our doctrines. It may as well be argued that the present Solar System ought to be put down by Act of Parliament, because in the whole parish of Whitechapel two Scripture Readers cannot find a single costermonger who believes in the doctrines of Copernicus. By the way, where did Mr. Nevile discover that the Royal Declaration prefixed to the XXXIX. Articles dates from 'the time when our Prayer-book was drawn up'?

'Spiritualism Prophetically Considered,' by William Maude (S. W. Partridge), is not a very remarkable little pamphlet; but it puts together

some curious extracts from accredited 'Spiritual' authorities on the really anti-Christian spirit of this absurd delusion. It is just worth notice that Miss Faithfull, 'Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty,' is also publisher of several Spiritual works, and that Mr. Howitt, an ex-Quaker, and one of the most forward of the advocates of Spiritualism, has lately received a Royal Pension.

We are not able to concur in all that Miss Bessie Parkes teaches, but her volume, 'Essays on Woman's Work' (Strahan), is very well written, and very well worth reading.

Mr. Wilson's 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury' (J. H. & J. Parker), goes further than its title suggests. He not only discusses how we may best revise the Daily Lessons; but he suggests certain important changes in the Rubrick.

Mr. Charles Miller, one of the most persevering and consistent men of the present age—although he carries on rather the traditions of the past—has added to his many services to Oxford and the Church, a 'Plea for Moral Philosophy and Law,' in a Letter to Lord Derby (Masters). This is sequel to a 'Plea for the Revival of the Study of the Common Law,' and both publications are designed to meet the hint, or insinuation, that the Universities are no longer qualified to conduct the higher education of the country. To this Mr. Miller replies, that they are, if they would only use the means at their disposal, and the method prescribed by their founders and benefactors.

'The Church—or Professor Selwyn?' (Rivingtons), is the title of an able vindication of the recent Oxford Declaration, by Mr. Richard Wilson—a name new to us. But he is a formidable antagonist in any dispute.

A paper by Mr. W. B. Badnall, 'On the Law of Pews' (J. H. & J. Parker), is to be commended to all Churchwardens, and to all Incumbents as well.

---

# INDEX TO VOL. L.

(NEW SERIES.)

## ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

### A.

Allies [see *Church of Christ*, &c.].  
Arabia and the Arabs [Palgrave], 337—398.

### B.

Biographies, Religious and Secular, 87—119.  
Bird, Rev. C. S. [see *Biographies*].  
Bright's Faith and Life [see *Faith*].  
Bull, Rev. W. [see *Biographies*].

### C.

Catacombs. The Catacombs of Rome, 1—13.  
Church of Christ, The Early Struggles of the  
[Merivale, *Allies*, *Lee*], 286—310.  
Church of England under Edward VI. and  
Elizabeth, 51—86.  
Christian Religion [see *Guizot*].  
Christendom, Divisions of [see *Ffoulkes*].

### E.

Eastern Liturgies, New Translation of the,  
424—436.  
Essayists, Ultramontane [see *Ultramontane*].

### F.

Faith and Life [Bright's], 437—458.  
Ffoulkes on the Divisions of Christendom,  
479—490.  
French Interdicted Priests and the Bishop of  
Oxford, 149—174.

### G.

Gnosticism [King's *Gnostics*, &c.], 459—478.  
Greek Philosophy [see *Zeller*].  
Guizot on the Christian Religion, 239—266.

### L.

Labouring Classes, Dwellings and Food of the,  
14—29.  
Lee [see *Church of Christ*, &c.].  
Liturgies, the Eastern [see *Eastern*].

### M.

Manning, Dr. [see *Ultramontane Essayists*].  
Mauditt, Le, 36—50.  
Merivale [see *Church of Christ*, &c.].

### O.

Oxford, Bishop of [see *French Interdicted  
Priests*].

### P.

Palgrave [see *Arabia*].  
Prayer Book, Revision of the, 200—234.

### R.

Rome, Catacombs of [see *Catacombs*].

### S.

Scottish Church and Bishop Torry, 175—199.

### T.

Theiner's Documents from the Vatican,  
311—356.  
Torry, Bishop [see *Scottish Church*].

### U.

Ultramontane Essayists, 119—148.

### V.

Vatican, Documents from the [see *Theiner*].

### Z.

Zeller on the Greek Philosophy, 399—419.

## SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

**JULY.**—Mr. Ffoulkes on the Divisions of Christendom—Essays on Social Subjects, contributed to the *Saturday Review*—For Life, a Story, by Louis Sand—Dr. Robinson's Physical Geography of the Holy Land—Mr. Sadler's Church Doctrine, Bible Truth—Mr. Cox's Church on the Rock—Missing Doctrine on Popular Preaching—Mr. Gerald Moultrie's Offices for Holy Week and Easter—Hymns for the Sea—Mr. Pratt's Letters on the Scandinavian Churches—Dr. Todd's Books of the Vaudois—Archdeacon Hale's Charge—Archdeacon Sinclair's Charge to the Middlesex Clergy—Dr. Webster's Dictionary of the English Language—Dean Goodwin's Commentary on S. Luke—Monthly Packet—Professor Goldwin Smith's Lectures on History—Mr. Glover's Translation of Ewald's Life of Christ.

**OCTOBER.**—Mr. T. T. Carter on the Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England—

Mr. Sedgwick's Library of Spiritual Songs—Miss Taylor's Hymns on the Atonement—S. Baring-Gould's Post-Medieval Preachers—Clark's Theological Library—Mr. Stanford's Symbols of Christ—Translation of Professor Hagenbach's German Rationalism: its Rise, Progress, and Decline—Dr. Irons on the Bible and its Interpreters—Mr. Churchill Babington's Introductory Lecture on Archaeology—Mr. Gerald Moultrie's Poem on the Martyrdom of S. Polycarp—Mr. Christopher Neville's Letter to Samuel Morley, Esq., Religion and Politics—Spiritualism Prophetically Considered, by William Maude—Miss Bessie Parkes' Essays on Woman's Work—Mr. Wilson's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury—Mr. Charles Miller's Plea for Moral Philosophy and Law—The Church, or Professor Selwyn? by Richard Wilson—Mr. W. B. Badnall on the Law of Pews.



—  
—  
—  
's  
or  
e,  
he  
ill  
e-  
he  
er  
l.:  
o-  
—  
's  
h-  
r's  
he  
rd  
aw

3